

CATHOLIC IMPERIALISM
AND WORLD FREEDOM



AVRO MANHATTAN

282 M27ci

67-32303

Manhattan

Catholic imperialism and world freedom

MAN

kansas city



public library

kansas city, missouri

Books will be issued only
on presentation of library card.

Please report lost cards and
change of residence promptly.

Card holders are responsible for
all books, records, films, pictures
or other library materials
checked out on their cards.

CATHOLIC IMPERIALISM
AND WORLD FREEDOM

By the same Author

SPAIN AND THE VATICAN
LATIN AMERICA AND THE VATICAN
THE VATICAN AND THE U.S.A.
THE VATICAN IN ASIA
RELIGION IN RUSSIA

CATHOLIC TERROR OVER EUROPE
THE RELIGIOUS MASSACRE OF YUGOSLAVIA

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AGAINST THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The Catholic Church Against the Twentieth Century

has been published in the following countries :

- First published in Great Britain by C. A. Watts & Co. Ltd., London.
First Czech ed. pub. by Nakladatelstvi Zivot a Prace, Prague, 1950.
Second Czech ed. pub. by Nakladatelstvi Zivot a Prace, Prague, 1951.
Bulgarian ed. pub. by Naroden Petchat, Sofia, 1949.
Polish ed. pub. by Czytelnik, Warsaw, 1950.
First Hungarian ed. pub. by Szikra Konyvkiado, Budapest, 1950.
Second Hungarian ed. pub. by Szikra Konyvkiado, Budapest, 1950.
Romanian ed. pub. by Romanian State Publishers, Bucharest, 1951.
Slovak ed. pub. by Tatran, Bratislava, 1951.
First Russian ed. pub. by State Publishing House, Moscow, 1949.
Second Russian ed. pub. by State Publishing House, Moscow, 1949.
Third Russian ed. pub. by State Publishing House, Moscow, 1950.
First American ed. pub. by Gaer Assoc. Inc., New York, Sept., 1949.
Second American ed. pub. by Gaer Assoc. Inc., New York, Oct., 1949.
Third American ed. pub. by Gaer Assoc. Inc., New York, Nov., 1949.
Fourth American ed. pub. by Gaer Assoc. Inc., New York, Jan., 1950.
Fifth American ed. pub. by Horizon Press Inc., New York, July, 1950.
Sixth American ed. pub. by Horizon Press Inc., New York, Nov., 1950.
First British ed. pub. by C. A. Watts & Co. Ltd., London, 1947.
Second British ed. pub. by C. A. Watts & Co. Ltd., London, 1950.
Hebrew ed. pub. by Hakibutz Hameuchad Pub. House Ltd., Tel-Aviv, Israel.

The Catholic Church Against the Twentieth Century has also been partially published, summarized, or amply quoted from and commented upon in Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Holland, New Zealand, Norway, and South Africa.

Selected Book of the Month (L.B.C.), New York, Feb., 1950.

Selected Book of the Month (P.B.C.), New York, Sept., 1950.

Cheap ed. (470 pages), at 5s., pub. by C. A. Watts & Co. Ltd., London.

Cheap ed. in cloth, at 10s., pub. by C. A. Watts & Co. Ltd., London.

American edition published as *The Vatican in World Politics*, \$3.75, Horizon Press, New York.

AVRO MANHATTAN

CATHOLIC
IMPERIALISM
AND
WORLD FREEDOM

WATTS & CO.

JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

First Published October, 1952

This book is copyright under the Berne Convention. Apart from any use specifically permitted under the Copyright Act, 1911, no portion may be reproduced without written permission. Inquiry should be made of the Publishers.

Printed and bound in Great Britain by Richard Clay and Co. Ltd., Bungay, Suffolk, after composition by Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ltd., Aylesbury, Bucks, and published by C. A. Watts and Co. Ltd., 5 and 6 Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4

DEDICATED TO

Contemporary Man,
terrorized,
enslaved,
deceived;
the exploited—but also the
predestined annihilator
of all tyrannies, ancient and new;
the architect
of the genuinely peaceful mankind
of the united World of the Future

KANSAS CITY (MO.) PUBLIC LIBRARY

6732303

FOREWORD

THE CONTENTS OF THIS WORK MAY PROVE CONTROVERSIAL. Controversy implies disagreement. This is often nurtured by doubts about the veracity of the source of information.

No documentation has intentionally been incorporated in these pages without its source being given. Most of it is drawn, on matters specifically connected with Catholicism, from Catholic Canon Laws, Papal encyclicals, and Vatican decrees; on specifically American problems, from documents of the U.S. Administration, which can be found among official American papers (e.g. in the Libraries of Congress, Washington). The principal sources for current affairs have been documents issued by various governments, or by international organizations such as U.N.O., as well as what are generally admitted to be most soberly authoritative organs—for example, the *Osservatore Romano*, the *London Times*, the *New York Times*, and a few others, religious or political mouthpieces of either national hierarchies, political parties, or various other official or semi-official bodies.

The vastness of the survey has inevitably focused a great deal of this work upon the global activities of the Vatican and of the U.S.A. on the one side, and of Soviet Russia and World Communism on the other. As it is meant to examine the world activities of the Catholic Church and of the U.S.A., and not those of their opponents, to have enlarged also upon those of the latter would have required another volume. Whenever the U.S.A. or Soviet Russia are mentioned, they are mentioned only in so far as their or Vatican policies have affected the contemporary global scene, whose implications consequently cannot be ignored.

Abundant notes and references are made throughout each chapter, and can be found at the end of the book.

PREFACE

SPARKLING AMID A BILLION-STARRED UNIVERSE, WANDERING in cosmic insignificance, there glides the Earth—the cradle and the tomb of Man.

Species blossomed upon her and vanished; generations came and went; religions preached and conquered; empires rose and fell. But Freedom, sought for millennia, is still a dream to this day.

Tyrannies, rooted in the past, are lording over a present shaken by the thunderous march of giants racing for the mastery of the world, where ideologies, championed by nations burning with hatred, have palisaded the continents for global atomic massacres; and Churches, hailing falling culture, are spurring the combatants to mutual annihilation.

One of these, the Catholic Church, consumed by Cimmerian dreams of formidable expansion, is biding her time to enforce her dominion upon the human race. Not only as a spiritual, but also as a political power, buttressed by the unshakable conviction that it is her destiny to conquer the planet.

In a century rocked by the ruthless administration of dictatorships of immense magnitude, riding delirious military monsters, such a credence may be laughed to scorn.

Yet a credence, if firmly believed, can become as real as reality. When magnified by multitudes, it is rendered irresistible. Beliefs have conquered conquerors, routed legions, made armies invincible, sired civilizations, dethroned nations. They have been, and are still, the curse or the blessing, the brake or the spur, to progress. In the past Buddhism conquered Asia; Islam the East; Christianity the West. Today, astounding new credos have already obscured the sun. 150,000,000 Americans, 200,000,000 Russians, have become their paladins; colossal armaments their swords. The Catholic is supported by 400,000,000 beings; a monolithic unit, exceeding the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union in numbers, unity, leadership, and faith.

Americans, Russians, and Catholics are all mobilized for war. *Freedom* is their clarion call. And yet, just because of it, freedom has never been so threatened as it is today. In its name they are enslaving the world. Whoever hesitates to submit to their kind of freedom is branded a foe of freedom. And hence to be destroyed; freedom having become the alternative to either global slavery or atomic incineration.

To the Catholic Church freedom has always meant Catholic freedom: namely, total Catholic dominion over the world. Catholic dominion, spelling total implementation of the most fundamental tenet of Catholicism, means only one thing: total extinction of whatever is non-Catholic.

The attempt of the Catholic Church to erase freedom wherever she is paramount is almost two thousand years old. Unprecedented machinations have characterized her conduct in the last few decades. Yesterday Fascism, one of her pet creatures, hurled mankind into World War II. Today its successors are hurling mankind into World War III. Like them, the Catholic Church has set up her standard, to enforce upon the twentieth century her own brand of freedom.

To that end, she has promoted immense hate crusades, inspired great ideological movements, supporting and opposing sundry contestants for world dominion so as ultimately to further her own, in the wake of military devastations.

The physical symbol of one of the most malevolent forces of modern times, however, will no longer enjoy unmerited immunity.

In World War III the Vatican will be incinerated, on a par with the cities of Europe, Russia, and America. Its ruins, then, more than famed ruins, will symbolize mankind's determination to make short work of all totalitarianisms. Prominent among these: certain most iniquitous ecclesiastical tyrannies which, in the name of religion, contributed so much to the destruction of contemporary Man. And, verily, the punishment meted to the Catholic Church will be singularly heavy, not only in Rome, but throughout the charred wasteland of an atomized world.

Ignorance of the true nature of such a treacherous enemy of man, consequently, is no longer permissible. The scope of this work is to throw light upon the leading role she is playing

in the global conspiracy now in progress, directed at strangling world liberty.

The sands of time have already run perilously low; for truly the portents in the skies speak of calamities beyond counting. The lesson to be learnt, therefore, had better be learnt in dead earnest, lest the light of freedom be totally extinguished, and mankind be made to plunge once more into the darkness and the terror of the past instead of into the peace and the glory of the future.

London.

A. M.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1	PAGE
THE IDEOLOGICAL COLLAPSE OF THE WEST AND WORLD REVOLUTION	1
The spiritual stagnation of contemporary society, and the failure of Christianity.	
CHAPTER 2	
WORLD FREEDOM AND CATHOLIC POWER	10
World Catholicism, World Communism, and a Catholic world.	
CHAPTER 3	
OMNIPOTENCE OF THE POPES AND THEIR CLAIMS TO UNIVERSAL DOMINION	20
The Popes, History, and the West. Papal spiritual and political might. Papal disposal of Ireland and of the Americas.	
CHAPTER 4	
PAPAL PROMOTION OF CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS SUPER- STITITION FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES	37
The Archangel Gabriel and television. Papal astronomical cataclysms. The "jumping sun"; the Virgin Mary; the American State Department and Pius XII. The world as a single Empire-Church.	
CHAPTER 5	
CATHOLIC POWER AND MODERN SOCIETY	59
The Catholic Church, marriage, and divorce. Catholicism and education. Church political directives to Catholics.	

CHAPTER 6	PAGE
DUAL NATURE OF CATHOLICS	85
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impossibility of Catholics being loyal citizens. Catholic antagonism to modern science. Catholic dictatorship in modern medicine. The Catholic death sentence against expectant mothers. 	
CHAPTER 7	
SUBJECTS OF THE CHURCH, FIRST—CITIZENS OF THE STATE, SECOND	108
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The astonishing case of Ireland. The inglorious surrender of Lord Strickland. Catholic laws, Catholic judges and Catholic justice. The Catholic Church—a supra-national power. 	
CHAPTER 8	
AUTHORITY, DEMOCRACY, AND THE POPES	134
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catholic denial that the people have any power. Papal maledictions against Magna Carta and the French and American revolutions. Catholicism opposes the abolition of slavery; curses "progress" and "modern culture." 	
CHAPTER 9	
CATHOLIC OPPOSITION TO FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE, OF SPEECH, AND OF THE PRESS	149
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Mental reservation," or typical Catholic dishonesty. Good Catholics, bad Catholics, ignorant Catholics, democracy and freedom. 	
CHAPTER 10	
THE HIDDEN MIGHT OF CATHOLIC DIPLOMACY	170
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vatican diplomats and their secret power. Catholic parties. Political Catholicism in England and the U.S.A. 	
CHAPTER 11	
CATHOLIC POWER OVER WORLD ORGANIZATIONS	188
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catholic international organizations. Catholic influence and the Council of Europe. Catholic pressure upon the United Nations. The "invisible member" of the U.N.O. assemblies. Vatican-American domination of U.N.O. True status of Vatican diplomatic envoys. 	

CONTENTS	XV
CHAPTER 12	PAGE
NATURE AND EXERTIONS OF VATICAN DIPLOMACY	208
The case of the British envoy to the Vatican and the Royal visits to the Pope.	
Vatican diplomacy and international espionage.	
Vatican diplomatic blackmail of the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia.	
CHAPTER 13	
DEADLINESS OF VATICAN DIPLOMACY IN PEACE	235
The cases of the Saar, of Alsace-Lorraine, of the Rhineland, and of a French Government.	
Vatican diplomacy and the rise of Mussolini.	
Vatican diplomacy and the rise of Hitler.	
CHAPTER 14	
DEADLINESS OF VATICAN DIPLOMACY IN WAR	254
Japan, the Philippines, the U.S.A., and the Vatican.	
Timor, Portugal, and the Nazi U-boats and the Pope.	
The fall of Mussolini; Cardinal Spellman, and the Allies.	
The Vatican's fateful secret, the invasion of Soviet Russia, and the plot to kill Hitler.	
CHAPTER 15	
VATICAN'S TOTAL WAR AGAINST HOSTILE STATES	273
Catholic promotion of political murder.	
Ireland's independence, Great Britain, and Vatican diplomacy.	
Vatican's promotion of the Mexican Civil War.	
Vatican's engineering of the Spanish Civil War.	
CHAPTER 16	
THE VATICAN AGAINST THE ORTHODOX CHURCH	298
The longest diplomatic war in history.	
The Vatican, Communism, and the Orthodox Church.	
A "Catholic Russia," Nazism, Islam, the U.S.A., and the Vatican.	
CHAPTER 17	
THE VATICAN AGAINST PROTESTANTISM	316
Catholic anti-Protestant odium, and Catholic "tolerance."	
The pattern of Catholic persecutions against Protestantism, in Europe, Asia, and the Americas.	

CHAPTER 18

PAGE

CATHOLIC IMPERIALISM AGAINST THE ASIATIC CONTINENT 340

Catholic Imperialism, the West, and Asia.

The Popes, the Great Khans, and various Catholic attempts to subjugate Mongolia, Manchuria, Siam, and the Chinese Empire.

Vatican promotion of civil war in Japan.

Nipponic reaction to Catholic Imperialism: 250 years of total sealing off of the Japanese Islands.

CHAPTER 19

THE PATTERN OF VATICAN MACHINATIONS AGAINST EUROPE BETWEEN THE SECOND AND THIRD WORLD WARS 366

Three kings, the Vatican, and the people.

Mortal sins, American dollars, general elections, and Russian invasions.

Catholic Poland, "the country fit for gentlemen and bishops to rule," and her missions after the First and Second World Wars.

Pilsudski's Danzig-Odessa Polish Empire.

"European liberation," as envisaged by the Vatican and the invisible government of the U.S.A.

Its significance.

CHAPTER 20

THE SPECTACULAR CASE OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY, OR THE VATICAN'S GREAT ATTEMPT TO PUT BACK THE CLOCK 397

Political machinations, religious persecutions, and the truth.

The Austro-Hungarian Empire. Its political significance in Catholic and European politics.

Seipel, Hitler, the Vatican and the U.S.A.'s schemes for Imperial resurrections.

"Emperor" Otto, Cardinal Spellman, Prince Primates, Pius XII, the U.S. State Department, and Hungary.

Cardinal Mindszenty, Budapest, Rome, and Washington.

Cardinal Mindszenty, Empress Zita, Canadian and American Convents, reluctant American diplomats, and cassocked plotters.

Mindszenty's scheme to overthrow the Hungarian Government and restore the Hungarian monarchy, and the third World War.

Poland, Central European Catholic Confederation, Rumanian Archbishops, and Vatican-American diplomacy.

Dukes, Counts, Barons, the Pope, Luce, and "civilization."

CONTENTS

xvii

CHAPTER 21

PAGE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME: GLOBAL CATHOLIC
TERROR AND THE FUTURE

430

Catholic Imperialism, Freedom, and the West.

Historical-political background of the ideal Catholic society of
"the future."

Yugoslavia, the Vatican, and Catholic terrorism.

Catholic concentration camps, Catholic forcible conversions, and
Catholic massacres.Half a million murdered. Archbishop Stepinac's and Pope Pius
XII's responsibility.

Total Catholic terror. World Freedom and the future.

CHAPTER 22

CONCLUSION

473

NOTES

486

BIBLIOGRAPHY

504

INDEX

506

1

THE IDEOLOGICAL COLLAPSE OF THE WEST AND WORLD REVOLUTION

WE LIVE IN TIMES WITHOUT EQUAL in human history, in days of a vertiginous progress and the unparalleled confusion of a century heading at breakneck speed towards the great cavernous emptiness of a most tenebrous future.

The whole earth, this poor planet of ours on which the blood does not seem to get a chance to dry, has become the arena of sanguinary spectacles and the tomb of captive aspirations and of scattered dreams.

Across broken cities and the ruins of nations and continents, heavy with the unknown pitfalls and the unmeasured dangers of an age gone awry, however, there can be heard the steady, relentless rhythm of something irresistible about to be born.

It is the throbbing of a new civilization, of the first global civilization in the history of man. This, indeed, is a portent worthy of a cry.

And yet the mood of contemporary man is dark, self-questioning, gloomy, and despairing. Wars and tyrannies of a new order have shaken his confidence and dispersed his illusions. The twentieth century, earmarked to be the

apotheosis of his ascent, has turned into the nightmarish aberration of a dark, hallucinatory underworld.

His conquest of space by flight and radio, his mastery of the atom, and all his spectacular technical advances have let loose, not the millennium, but the great deluge. Incommensurable new problems have opened the gates to devastating political tornadoes, promoted gigantic social upheavals, engineered formidable economic revolutions.

Man's scientific achievements have not only transformed his external existence, they have changed his relation to matter, stultified his ideas of the universe, questioned the veracity of moral values, belaboured his innermost pet beliefs, casting startling doubts upon his own uniqueness, the purpose of all, and upon life itself.

The world of tradition, of dogma, and of certainty is perilously tottering and near to collapse. It is tumbling.

Modern science has filled his life with a sombre incertitude and his future with disaster. And progress, having turned calamitous, has wrapped the earth in a tempestuous semi-darkness. Is it the twilight of a world about to die, or the dawn of a world about to be born?

Hence man's dilemma: the dilemma of a century in transition.

But, standing against the wasteland of the present, there are giants; giants scheming the conquest of the world—the global offspring of forces generated by two conflicting civilizations, feeding, the one on tradition, the other on revolution.

Their enmity, however, seemingly caused by economic discordance, in reality is the hostility of two divergent philosophies, eager to stamp the age with their own mark. Philosophies are not mere abstractions: they are true, concrete, pressing, and hard realities. They are the sires of ideologies, the souls of nations, the begetters of doctrines, and thus the foundation stones of all political structures. As economic systems generate political problems, so moral doctrines, by reverberating in social issues, will affect also political movements and consequently economic systems. The philosophies from which they have sprung, or those which they have

moulded, therefore, will direct the mode of life of individuals and, indeed, of whole cultures.

The rise of the great contemporary inimical ideologies is thus the concrete manifestation not only of material but also of immensely profound moral problems. More, it is the incarnation of two irresistible antagonistic ways of life, determined to conquer the globe. The more formidable of these seems to be championing the absolute supremacy of the community as opposed to that of the individual. Hence its demands for the levelling of classes, the redressing of racial injustices, the economic equality of all men—that is to say, for a world revolution. Its goal could prove a mirage. But, as the inspirer of all the disinherited of the earth, it is universal.

Its counterpart claims to stand for the freedom of the individual as opposed to that of the community, and therefore for the survival of the fittest, the exploitation of man by man, of society by its members. By its very nature it favours only a successful minority. Consequently it is narrow, limited, and inadequate.

Since the incursion of the former, its ideological opponent has been wholly unable to produce anything more inspiring than the mode of life of a traditional society which is being steadily rejected by an ever-growing portion of mankind.

Past civilizations, when reduced to such sterility, perished.

The lack of an ideology has forced it to seek the equivalent of one. And its find is religion, an ally as powerful as the one it is supposed to fight; the standard-bearer of a philosophy as potentially universal as that preaching world revolution.

That religion, concerned chiefly with spiritual problems, should be employed as the main instrument to check a materialistic ideology concerned mostly with economic issues seems, at first, paradoxical. But a materialistic philosophy, by transcending purely economic problems, can develop a kind of mysticism. It can provoke feelings akin to religion. Indeed, it can become a religion. More, it can turn into a revolutionary creed preaching an entirely new conception of the purpose of existence—that is to say, of the relationship of man with what he believes life and the universe are about.

The fundamental issue between the hostile ideologies now splitting the world is basically religious. Is human life to be

lived by the full man, in a full manner, here; or is his ultimate destiny to be found in a future world? Is this earth nothing more than a place of transition to another kind of existence elsewhere; or is it a home in which the complete man can find his complete self?

Until recently mankind had accepted the age-old experience that life meant a grim struggle, to be fought resignedly because God or fate had so decreed. Now, however, it has decidedly revolted against such acceptance. And a new world philosophy has appeared, affirming that man has to live fully here on earth. Science has accelerated this rebellion. Hence the strides of principles rejecting the degradation of man under impersonal forces, and their identification of religion with a society permitting the tacit exploitation of men by men, of classes by classes, and of races by races.

A demand for freedom, far more potent than any that the past has had to offer, is thus being put forward. And the challenge is found in the question whether society in its present form has the moral power to give a satisfactory answer to such a claim.

This is not simply a question of the disposal of economic forces. It is something which, by going deeper, becomes a question of religion, which only religion can answer.

In a world rocked to its foundations by colossal concrete problems, such a conclusion seems absurd, yet is not so.

For religion, although in a swift decline, is not dead. It is not even disappearing, as many are inclined to believe. It is simply sinking deeper into the innermost chambers of emotional man. It is still there, alive, potent, and dynamic. It can as yet move individuals, nations, and civilizations. When it jets to the surface, it can assume strange shapes and weird disguises. It can be boldly monopolized by a Church, or be made to die a slow, sordid death by the empty-staring masses brooding on the rumbling escalators of the metropolis. It can still be accepted with a tacit individual and mass inner scepticism, if not actual unbreathed sneers, by a conventionally agnostic society, scorned by the inward despair of generations reared in the ruins of world wars, or it can infuse with a Messianic spirit the most materialistic ideology yet produced by our civilization. Whatever shape it is made to assume,

whatever role it is made to play, it is still the most formidable *deus ex machina* of mankind.

Our age, perhaps the least religious age that ever was, has seen the most astounding demonstration of this: a revolutionary ideology which, by preaching a materialistic creed, has sublimated its own materialism with all the inner belief of a living religion, thus proving that religious feeling, if adroitly directed, is a force which nothing can stop; indeed, that when properly harnessed with grievances of a concrete and urgent character, it is irresistible.

The global revolution now in progress, therefore, although promoted mainly by economic forces, is not moved solely by a materialistic belief. It is a philosophy promoting economic revolution. It is a creed with the inner fire of a religion, the driving power of a social rebellion, and the dynamism of ideas bursting asunder the foundations of society.

By imbuing itself with mysticism, it has transformed its most opaque facet with the redeeming translucency of a faith outside which there is no salvation, the secret of its astonishing expansion.

It has done more. By partaking of the nature of a belief, its appeal has become universal. The essence of religion is universality. It is above all geographical, political, racial, intellectual barriers. The subdivisions of mankind cannot impede it from reaching all strata of society, from appealing to all intellects, from stirring all kinds of emotions, from giving scope to the strongest and most elusive aspirations of men.

The most revolutionary ideology of our times has girdled the globe with the blazing flames of an unquenchable fire.

Mere economic injustices would never have been able to do that.

The universality of religion, however, is not that of individual religions. When religion is patterned into systems its universality is lessened by the framework within which it has been bound. It is further reduced when it is changed into an organized belief and restricted still more when transformed into a Church.

This imperils not only its vitality, but also its appeal. For by being divided within itself, it splits into sundry creeds at variance with one another. Its universality is even more

reduced when, having become an intrinsic part of the society within which it has grown, it identifies itself with a particular race or civilization. When that occurs a faith suffers additional loss, for, by becoming indissolubly bound to specific economic or political systems, it is soon crippled and paralysed.

Loss of freedom spells immobility. Immobility, retrogression. Retrogression, reaction. Reaction, hostility to innovation and thus to progress. Once it has been reduced to this, organized religion turns into the staunchest advocate of the past, grows suspicious of the future, and is the bitterest enemy of all forces claiming redress.

The great world faiths have all followed such an evolution. Originally inspired by principles of universality, after a rapid expansion they identified themselves with a particular culture, turned stagnant, and became the stubborn protectors of immutability.

The main revolutionary philosophy of our times has not yet reached that stage. It is still burning with principles of universality. Hence its spectacular expansion, carried out with the rapidity of Islam, the steadiness of Buddhism, and the dynamism of Christianity in their early stages.

But, in addition to these fundamental prerequisites, this philosophy is rendered even more dynamic by something which all faiths have constantly lacked, disregarded, or even purposely ignored: its assertion that its principles can be made into a concrete, practical reality for all, here and now.

By preaching this, it strikes at the very foundations of religion. For, whereas traditional religion aims at the welfare of man in a problematical future life, regardless of his present, our revolutionary philosophy aims at his physical welfare, regardless of any problematical future existence.

To do this, it has integrated material and spiritual motives into a monolithic system, directed at the rational amelioration of mankind.

Unlike at the time of the rise of the great religions, now the world is truly one and is becoming increasingly so. The abolition of distance has telescoped men, ideas, and cultures into a variegated but integral, inseparable whole, where a materialistic conception of life has become the hall-mark of a century of catastrophes.

Men, like civilization—and civilization, like nature—abhor a vacuum. Whenever emptied, they need to be filled again with something, for neither can stand erect for long on hollow foundations. In the past, wherever a void was created, wherever a culture was near disintegration, there a great religion rushed in, either to fill the gap or to build upon the ruins of the fallen.

At present all great contemporary civilizations are on the verge of collapse. Hence the universal void, the sire of a new, revolutionary conception of life and of man's place in society. This, having produced radical economic and social doctrines, has finally been sublimated into a kind of lay religion. And the new religion is Communism.

But whereas, owing to their geographical remoteness, the great spiritual movements of the past remained regional, now the new philosophy, owing to its inner essence and to the shrinking of the globe, has become universal. And, as once the great religions were the foundations upon which their respective civilizations were constructed, so now this new revolutionary philosophy, unless checked by a more inspiring one, seems destined to become the foundation stone upon which a new global civilization will ultimately be erected. In millennia gone by, cultures were built upon the spiritual values of religions, which begot political and economic systems. Ours, on the contrary, is being erected upon the religious indifference of applied science, the mercenary principles of powerful economic and political systems, and the a-religious tenets of a world civilization in the making.

A multiplicity of causes, such as the stratification of the great world beliefs, with the stagnation of their original principles, the continual emphasis on the importance of a problematic future life, their stubborn defence of the traditional structure of society, and their inability to attune themselves to the rapid changes caused by applied science, are responsible for this.

To these can, perhaps, be added the growing indifference of religions and the cynicism of the masses towards the Churches, the tolerators of immense injustices, the supporters of wars and of nations preaching war, the sponsors of colossal hate campaigns, in stark contradiction to the fundamental origin, essence, and simplicity of true religion.

These and sundry other factors have split the planet into two colossal ideological battlefields: that of organized religions, backed by, and backing, forces advocating the retention of the old order of things; and that of a revolutionary philosophy advocating the physical welfare of man and the setting up of an equalitarian society with no barriers of class, colour, or race.

Notwithstanding their alliance with the Churches, the forces of tradition are everywhere in retreat. Organized religion, therefore, although powerful, is bound to fail as the substitute for an ideology which a traditional society is unable to produce, even for its own survival. Such a conflict, being more than a struggle of ideas or of two hostile economic systems, has become the sire of two global ideologies, one appealing to the teeming masses of the earth, the other to the fast-diminishing minority of those who possess.

Organized religion, therefore, by identifying itself with a crumbling civilization, is courting its doom. Concern with the welfare of only a small portion of mankind is a rejection of universalism. And rejection of universalism, when the world is marching towards unity, means only one thing: extinction.

The disruption of organized religion, even if it is destined to a swiftly accelerating decline and total eclipse, would not, however, mean the end of religion as such. For its original teachings, by upholding the ideal of true human brotherhood, of the true equality of man before man in the spiritual as well as in the economic field, could still become the most formidable opponents of a rapacious conception of society. More, by voluntarily accepting the liquidation of the enormous injustices which organized religion has stubbornly supported, it could demonstrate that the concept of history as the by-product of mere economic forces, while partly justified, is erroneous and harmful.

It could go further: by proving that, were any oncoming civilization to deny intangible values, it would court disaster.

A society top-heavy with mammon is bound to perish. The pitiful remains of past mighty empires are mute witnesses that the great dominions of Babylon and Nineveh, of ancient Egypt, of Rome and of the Caliphs, when laden with this scourge, toppled over and plunged to their doom.

True religion could prevent ours from following their fate. Its most ennobling principles, however, are not enough. The world is a hard world. Mankind stands before concrete situations; and these situations have to be solved by practical means. The great bulk of the masses are bewildered, tempted, and stunned by the tangible allure of physical betterment. Man, although spirit, is also body. To care solely for his spiritual needs and to disregard his material ones will lead the Churches to final extinction. World revolution is striding the globe with the steps of a giant, because of the ever-more-irresistible demand for universal justice.

The checking, reduction, or suppression of such a demand through hate or war is a mirage whose reality is disaster. The fecundity of hate breeding hate is enough to dethrone the reason of individuals and continents. It will never arrest the forward march of ideas. For ideas thrive in the minds of men. The smashing of an ideological enemy by violence will result in the material defeat being turned into inevitable moral victory, and the vanquished, rendered indestructible by the universality of its principles, ultimately will multiply its conquests.

Yet organized religion, although menaced by imminent ruin, continues to ignore the harsh realities of a world in transition, wholly unperturbed by the lamentations of the multitudes, vainly crying to a deaf God for the practical redress of immense misery that has already lasted for millennia.

Indeed, as if eager to accelerate still further its rapid decline, it chooses to ride with the least enlightened forces of a society which the masses of the world are increasingly rejecting: and more—to become the paladin of combatants preparing to make their mode of life prevail, not by the creation of more ennobling ideals, but by the use of force, the launching of global wars upon a mankind stunned by unheard-of disasters, the curse of the present and the fear of a future heavy with the terrors of a civilization tumbling like a falling star towards self-annihilation by the chilly glare of the atom.

2

WORLD FREEDOM AND CATHOLIC POWER

THE INABILITY OF ORGANIZED religion to supply its allies with an ideology, however, does not signify that it is not their most potent supporter. Deprived of it, it is doubtful whether traditional society could have withstood the challenge of the times without perishing.

For religion is still the mightiest foe of revolution. The scope of the revolution now in progress is universal. As organized religion is to be found everywhere, it follows that it is fighting on a global front and that its alliance with anti-revolutionary forces is world-wide. The struggle being fiercer in some places than in others, the dominating religion reacts at its fiercest where the revolutionary blows are most devastating. And the region where the fighting is most intense is certainly the West.

Here the partnership of tradition and religion is found at its closest. For here we have the most dynamic conservative powers of the twentieth century: a militantly organized belief—Christianity—and the most successful accumulator of wealth—Capitalism; the two most potent anti-revolutionary forces in the world.

A religion, when striking root within a civilization, will

partake of the main nature of the races forming it. Since its transplantation from the Near East, Christianity has become Western. And that means that, although its initial momentum of expansion has long since diminished, it has still retained sufficient vitality to outdistance all other beliefs in its ambitions, vigour, and combativity.

Of all the great faiths, Christianity is the only one still engaged on the launching of vast organizations operating across nations—indeed, continents—inspiring great missionary movements, mobilizing crusades to check, fight, and destroy its enemies.

This in itself would be sufficient to make of it the most powerful belief in the globe and the most potent foe of Communism. But when it is made the very foundation upon which the lay partner has built its threatened economic system, then Christianity is infused with additional incommensurable strength. For then it is no longer made to stand upon its merits alone. It is sustained by the might of the most industrialized provinces of the world. That is to say, it is backed by the political prestige of nations based upon Christian principles, by the economic power of systems built upon Christian doctrines, protected by the military might of Christian armies operating the most devastating weapons yet invented by man.

This could not be otherwise, Christianity having become more than the provider of an ideology for the West—an intrinsic part of the Western world. Without its support, traditional Western civilization would have crumbled long ago; while, inversely, organized Christianity, without the support of the West, would never have survived in its present shape to our day.

But if such an alliance gives Christianity strength, it is also the cause of its weakness. For Christianity is being increasingly rejected by a growing number of individuals. It is scorned by whole strata of Western society, as an ideology and as a religion—and this mainly because of its stubborn support of its conservative associates. It is significant that powerful revolutionary movements exist in all the Western nations, and that a large number of Westerners, though believers, repudiate it as an advocate of a civilization permitting the enormous injustices by which they are afflicted. Such alliance

has weakened Christianity also beyond the West, where it is spurned by the greater part of the human race as being hopelessly identified with the rapacity of the Western world, of Western imperialism, and of Western white supremacy.

Notwithstanding such cracks in its armour, however, Christianity is still, as a whole, a mighty force capable of profoundly influencing contemporary affairs.

But where it is rendered even more formidable is where the genuine universality contained in its original seedling has been made to grow into a monster oak-tree, under the shadows of which there has been hatched the most sinister incarnation of despotism ever known, and which, in the name of a belief, has made innumerable attempts to conquer mankind: the Catholic Church.

The Catholic Church is neither genuine religion nor true Christianity. It is the repository of a formidable homogeneous will, self-sufficient, impersonal, ruthless, and omnipotent; the sum of a hoary ecclesiasticism contaminated by the most unscrupulous tyranny in the world; the creature of a vindictive theology and of a most vitiated orthodoxy, rooted in a vanished military dominion whose dreams she has transmuted into one of imperial global dimensions.

Although originally derived from the same doctrines from which sprang the Orthodox Church and Protestantism, her intransigence, aggressiveness, and unbounded ambitions are of such a nature as to render her not only the most dangerous standard-bearer of a grossly distorted Christianity, but also the most powerful religious organization on earth, supported by an army 400,000,000 strong. The exertions of such an institution, with all the prestige of antiquity, the experience of two millennia, an internal organization perfected in all its details by forty generations and brought under a process of unheard-of centralization, have contributed more than anything living to shape the destiny of many nations and hence that of the Western world.

Unlike other faiths, she has never restricted her activities to the regions where she was predominant. Limitations of any kind have constantly been ignored. The very right of existence of other religions has always been wholly disregarded—indeed, trampled underfoot or by-passed.

The stemming away of two such large portions of what she considered to be part of herself as the Orthodox Church and Protestantism, although perforce rendering her almost regional, by limiting her territory chiefly to Southern and Central Europe, left her as universally ambitious in spirit, practice, policy, and claims as ever.

Her intractability, however, was not limited merely to geographical domains. It was enforced in the religious and social realms, where she became strikingly and malevolently nefarious. For her presupposed uniqueness, while making her impervious to territorial or administrative changes, made her allergic also to any modifications which in her eyes might weaken, diminish, or destroy the wholeness of the doctrines upon which she rested.

Such doctrines, she claimed, were her sole monopoly. They sprang from direct divine commission. They were immutable. Thus she, being based upon them, partook of their immutability, as did her whole religious, moral, ethical, and social structure. Modifications of any kind, consequently, became anathema, whether within or outside herself.

This made her rigid, inflexible, and unchangeable, a subjugator and an enemy of society, a disapprover of reforms not inspired by her, irreformable, incorrigible, and irrepressible, where submission was regarded as primary, and intellectual torpor a paramount virtue. The result was an increasing loss of adaptability, and hence a growing estrangement from an ever-evolving civilization.

All living organisms, to evolve, must change, move, and grow. The two main branches of Christendom followed this natural process. They freely adapted themselves to their environment, evolving parallel with the lay society within which they developed.

The Orthodox Church never estranged herself for long from the evolution of the society around her. After a millennium with the Byzantine Empire, she struck roots in her former missionary territories, the lands of the Slavonic races, becoming an integral moulder of their civilization. After several more centuries, having identified herself with the Czars, she shared their fate and collapsed with them. Although the Bolshevik revolution reduced her almost to nil, it took her only a few

decades to adapt herself to the new order of things. This meant that, besides complying with the demands of a radically changed environment, she continued to play no mean role in the Slavonic world, of which she remained the paramount inspiration, even after almost the whole of it had erected its political systems upon Communism.

Protestantism, likewise, having developed mainly in Northern Europe, was soon associated with the Northern peoples, and gave continual support to the social, economic, political, and cultural framework of a Protestant civilization. Protestant emphasis upon freedom of conscience and individual liberty, amplified by its sundry divergent denominations, endowed it with an exceptional theological elasticity. This meant an almost automatic tolerance towards new doctrines, new principles, and new ideas. The result was its adaptation to a rapidly evolving society, with the minimum of resistance. Wherever Protestantism flourished, there civil liberties appeared, laying their foundations of those basic principles upon which modern society, and thus our contemporary world, is erected.

The Catholic Church never followed this course. Notwithstanding all the religious and political disasters that befell her and the innumerable occasions on which she stultified herself before the world, instead of evolving flexible formulas, she redoubled her intransigence with ever more determined purpose and concentrated energy, to make the gulf between her and an evolving society wholly impassable—this to such an extent that at long last she became practically irreconcilable with the thought, practice, and theory of the contemporary world.

The consequence was the relentless war she has since waged against Liberalism, Secularism, Democracy, and any government or State practising them. Wherever she could do so, their doctrines were anathematized, hence the suppression of civil liberty, freedom of conscience, and even economic enterprise. The result was that, whereas countries moulded on Protestantism flourished, those dominated by Catholicism plunged headlong into an abysmal decay.

The gap between an immovable Catholic Church and an ever more rapidly changing society continued to widen, until it was rendered almost unbridgeable with the appearance of

Socialism and incommensurable with the birth of its extreme offspring, Communism.

Thus, whereas the Orthodox Church could reach a *modus vivendi* with Communism, and whereas Protestantism is inclined to recognize the justice of some of its claims, the Catholic Church has uncompromisingly rejected it as a philosophy, an economic system, and a political movement.

The Catholic Church and Communism, therefore, find themselves at the two most extreme poles of the ideological warfare of the modern world: the Catholic Church as the most conservative, irreformable world institution in existence, Communism as the most revolutionary, dynamic ideology as yet produced by man. By the very fundamental law of the transmutability of religious principles into moral, social, economic, and political ones and, in reverse, of economic doctrines into political, social, ethical, moral, and therefore religious tenets, their hostility finds expression in the economic, social, and political fields—indeed, often even in the open employment of brute force and war.

The most formidable, stubborn, and dangerous opponent to Communism, therefore, is the Catholic Church, while the best organized and most powerful opponent of the Catholic Church is Communism. Being the living incarnations of these most extreme conceptions of life in existence on our planet, they have become the embodiment of two irreconcilable worlds: one wanting to mould society with a philosophy conceived by a culture long since dead, the other born and growing in the present, attempting to remould the globe with principles seemingly Utopian but potentially realizable in a civilization as yet to come.

Thus, while the fountain-head of Catholic dynamism springs from the deepest recesses of a world buried in the past, that of Communism draws inspiration from a world still in the womb of the future, each burning with the irresistible will to shape a bewildered mankind in its own way.

.

If the Catholic Church were simply a peculiar brand of Christianity mainly confined to wherever Catholicism is predominant, she would be an enemy powerful enough to be

counted as one of the most dangerous by any ideology sponsoring revolution. But the Catholic Church is nothing of the kind. She is as unlike Protestantism and the Orthodox Church as these are unlike non-Christian religions. Although fundamentally partaking of the eschatological philosophy of all faiths, she is as unlike Islam and Buddhism as Communism is unlike traditional religion.

The Catholic Church is a Church uncompromisingly her own. Not only does she not consider herself on a par with, but she believes herself above all Christian denominations—indeed, above the religions of the entire world: the only true Church, the only true religion, divinely instituted, divinely commissioned, divinely inspired, divinely protected, the unique repository of truth. Truth being one, those outside her are in error. All other religions, therefore, are false. Truth being to falsehood what right is to wrong, justice to injustice, light to darkness, it follows that truth must prevail over error, as right must prevail over wrong and justice over injustice. The Catholic Church, being the only true Church, must, therefore, prevail over error—i.e. over all other Churches. As the only repository of truth, she has the right to fight wrong—i.e. anyone not upholding the truth. As she is the only upholder of truth, and as, therefore, all non-Catholic denominations and religions are wrong, it is her right to see that they accept the truth—that is, the Catholic Church.

But truth, like right, is by its very nature universal. Hence the task of the Catholic Church is to see that Catholicism is universally accepted—namely, that it is embraced by all individuals, all institutions, and all nations. Her exertions, therefore, are restricted neither to Catholic countries nor to the predominantly Christian West; they extend to all races, embrace all continents, are directed against all faiths, immutably, irresistibly, eternally guided by the fixed star of the Catholic Church: the unmitigated universal subservience of the whole of the human race.

Such claims are not mere theoretical speculation. They are her very foundation stones. She acts upon them. Her history has been shaped by them. Her present activities revolve around them. She has erected her standards and distributed her chief forces all over the planet to achieve them. They are the very

archway without which her whole edifice would collapse. Consequently they must be taken in earnest.

That any Church should declare all others erroneous, ask for their suppression, and openly state it to be her exclusive right to convert the whole globe, is as objectionable as it is deserving of utter condemnation.

But the Catholic Church does not confine herself to the exclusive monopoly of the religious allegiance of men. With deliberate vampiric deadliness, she goes further, by claiming that human society, in virtue of her being the unique repository of truth, must be erected only upon truth—that is to say, upon her doctrines.

The portentous significance of this is evident. For religion is not only a theological system, but also a moral one. Its essence, therefore, besides being the relationship of man to God, is also the relationship of man to man—i.e. of man to society.

Moral tenets, the by-products of religious ones, are the result of this. But moral tenets are inseparable from ethical, ethical from social ones, whereas economic, political, and ideological doctrines cannot be disassociated from each other or, inversely, from the social, ethical, moral, and, finally, religious principles whence ultimately they all derive.

The structures of traditional contemporary society, therefore, are still fundamentally based upon the tenets derived from religion. Now, if contemporary society is erected upon erroneous religious principles, it follows that their by-products, from moral to economic ones, are also erroneous. Hence the necessity for their substitution by ones based on the truth. As there is only one truth—Catholic truth—such new, true principles must be Catholic.

The economic, social, and political structures of Christian countries which have rejected the truth—that is to say, all the nations where Protestantism or the Orthodox Church is predominant—fall into this category, as do those built upon Islam, Buddhism, or, indeed, any other religion.

By virtue of this, the Catholic Church claims it to be her right to alter the social and political structure of contemporary society throughout the world, and thus she is converted into a most powerful engine of spiritual aggression.

Her exertions, which are simultaneously carried out everywhere, are therefore aimed at the total disruption of the religious, social, and political edifices of all nations. Her ultimate object is their utter demolition, so that a civilization based exclusively upon her doctrines can be erected in their place.

The Catholic Church, therefore, is not only a Church aiming, with vulturine greed, at the extinction of all other faiths, but also a most powerfully callous political institution working for the liquidation of a society not inspired by her.

Consequently she is fighting Communism as a universal religion dealing with sociological matters as well as a political institution dealing with religious issues; while, inversely, Communism is fighting the Catholic Church as a political-religious institution dealing with sociological and political problems.

Communist-Catholic enmity, therefore, is the most formidable enmity in existence, their antagonism taking place simultaneously on individual, regional, and global dimensions. It is the most formidable, not solely because of the inherent universality of their antagonism, but, above all, because each sees in the other the most redoubtable rival to its ultimate goal.

Paradoxically enough, in this respect Catholicism is as revolutionary as Communism, both having the same aim: the wiping out of the present structure of society everywhere—except, of course, where a Catholic or a Communist society is already in existence—and their substitution by a wholly Catholic or Communist one all over the globe.

The Catholic Church's fight is one to save neither religion, freedom, nor Christian civilization. It is a fight to save Catholic religion, Catholic freedom, Catholic civilization. Her opposition to world revolution is not caused by her wish to save the freedom of the world, but by her wish to continue her old fight *against* the freedom of the world. It is the latest episode in her unrelenting struggle to eliminate the most dangerous of her contemporary enemies—Communism today, Socialism yesterday, Democracy and Liberalism in the last century, Protestantism in the eighteenth, seventeenth, and sixteenth centuries, the Turks in the fifteenth and fourteenth, the German Emperors in the thirteenth, the Heretics in the twelfth

and eleventh, the Orthodox Church in the tenth and ninth, and the Barbarians in the centuries following the collapse of the Roman Empire. In each epoch she has malevolently directed immense crusades against anyone impeding her conquests.

Each time that one of these was branded by her as the enemy of religion, of progress, or of civilization, allies fought with her for what they believed to be their freedom, only to find that, once the supposed enemy had been defeated, the Catholic Church had grown in power, their strength had been weakened, and their liberty restricted or eliminated altogether; this, while the freedom for which they had raised their standards had been imperilled more than ever by the claims, exertions, and policy of their former Catholic partner.

At present most of the religious and democratic forces throughout the world have clustered with terrible urgency around the Catholic Church, the chief promoter of a mighty army against a common foe, persuaded that to strike an alliance with her will ensure their freedom by checking a world revolution.

The twentieth century has already proved the fallacy of such a belief.

Revolutions feed on misery. Misery is intensified by wars. Wars are the destroyers of the wealth of nations. In our times they are the sires of global upheavals, and thus the instruments of world collapse. The more civilization is weakened, the easier it is for the revolutionary virus to spread. The old structures of an already tottering civilization are destined to crumble. Religions, cultures, and ideologies which rely upon force to move the spirit of men are doomed to failure. To bank upon the alliance of a partner with the ambitions of Catholicism, therefore, is to court bankruptcy. Should the white race fail to produce something more inspiring than that, then it is truly closing time in the gardens of the West.

3

OMNIPOTENCE OF THE POPES AND THEIR CLAIMS TO UNIVERSAL DOMINION

FROM THE MOMENT WHEN, IT IS reputed, Peter, a fisherman from Galilee, set foot in the glittering capital of the Roman Empire until today, the mighty tides of history, which have risen and receded, battering and engulfing in the quicksands of time, kingdoms, dynasties, religions, peoples, nations, political systems, men, ideas—indeed, whole civilizations—have been powerless to destroy those towering defiers of the millennia: the Popes.

Popes have succeeded Popes, steadily, uninterruptedly, stubbornly, despite enemies and friends, corruption, disasters, hatred, persecutions, and the mighty blows of the centuries.

They were executed, exiled, murdered, replaced, dethroned—and yet a Pope was ever watching and often directing the turbulent mass-movements of mankind rolling across the riotous landscape of history.

Nero, Caligula, Diocletian, Constantine, Julian the Apostate, and all the many other emperors, protectors, or haters of Christianity came and went, but the Popes remained. The

Roman eagles which had spread their wings from the skies of Britain to those of Africa, from Spain to the Danube, vanished, never to return, but the Popes remained.

The Popes witnessed the birth of Constantinople and the collapse of the Roman Empire, the sacking of Rome and the oncoming of the Barbarians—the extinguishers of the civilization of the West.

They dealt with the Huns and the Vandals, with the Avars and the Goths, and with all the numberless destroyers of culture pounding upon the ancient world as pitilessly and as terribly as the scourge of God.

They saw idols in Mecca, heard the voice of a one-time camel-driver chanting in distant Arabia a strange, irresistible chant—“There is no other God than God, and Mahomet is his Prophet”—echoing like thunder to the marching of the armies of the caliphs rolling to the conquest of the East, burning with a faith made invincible by the sword and by the message of the Koran.

They watched Islam sweep forward with the violence of a tornado, its followers glide like whirlwinds from the desert, take Asia, Africa, and Europe by surprise. They saw the lights of the nations of flourishing Eastern Christianity being extinguished, their churches converted into mosques, their congregations massacred or enslaved, until finally no longer Christ but Mahomet was acknowledged the true Prophet of God in the very lands which had produced the Tertullians, the Origenes, the Chrysostoms, the Augustines, and all the other great Fathers of the Church.

They participated in the creation of the first Frankish Empire and heard the earliest wailings of the birth-pangs of the emerging European nations. They saw Gaul evolve into France, the roving German tribes settle, Britain invaded by the Saxons and conquered by the Normans. They trembled before the peril of the succeeding Mongolian invasions, and heard the hooves of the cavalries of Genghis and Kublai Khan thunder from the easternmost tip of the Siberian tundras to Hungary and the vineyards of the Rhineland.

They observed the tide of the Saracens invade Spain, ravage France, reach the gates of Vienna; the longships of the wild Vikings force their way up to the Seine and sack Paris; they

envied the splendour of fabulous Baghdad, the seat of Haroun al Rashid, the greatest of the caliphs.

We see Popes on the threshold of the first millennium dominate like giant shadows the darkness of the deepest Middle Ages. We see them deal with Hugh Capet and King Canute, with William the Conqueror and with Richard Cœur de Lion; we hear them hurl bolts against the Byzantine emperors and send encouragements to the remote Muscovites fighting against the Tartar invasions. We see them inspire the great mass-movements of the Crusades, hurl Christendom against Saladin and his successors, engineer alliances with the rulers of the West, spin counter-alliances against the great potentates of the East; deal with the rising Italian Republics emerging from the tenebrous skies of the Dark Ages, where the dawn of the oncoming Renaissance had rapidly begun to break, unveiling the lost cultures of Greece and Rome to the incredulous eyes of an ignorant, uncouth Europe.

We see Popes promote the erection of majestic cathedrals and the creation of universities, encourage the foundation of religious orders, hospitals, academies, and schools. We see them listen in astonishment to the tales of Marco Polo and his Island of Zipangu. We hear of Popes admonished by a Bernard, reproached by a Catherine, and cursed by Dante; we watch others smash the Turkish might at Lepanto, summon Christian Europe to the help of Constantinople, bless Christopher Columbus, and apportion the Americas. We see them patronize in princely magnificence the Raphaels, Michelangelos, and Leonardos and protect and encourage the arts and humanities, the begetters of the modern world.

But we see them also force Henry, the German Emperor, to kneel for three days in the snows of Canossa for doubting the supremacy of the ecclesiastical over the civil power; and we hear the halls of the great universities of Italy and Spain, of France and England, echo with Papal anathemas. We hear their voices order the massacre of the Albigenses, summon John Huss and have him put to death; we see them raise the terror of the Inquisition and order the Torquemadas to light the medieval towns with the burning bodies of heretics and of scholars. We hear Popes speak ill of the imitators of

Gutenberg and of the multiplication of the printing presses, fulminate against Luther and Calvin, hurl curses against Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth. We see Popes arm Catholic potentates against ever-growing Protestantism, fight in the Great Schism, plunge into the Hussite slaughters, and promote most of the wars of religion which ravaged the West for hundreds of years.

We see them frown upon new astronomical discoveries, issue dark threats against the secret speculations of Copernicus, condemn Galileo for asserting that the earth moves; while others, on the very threshold of the seventeenth century, have a Giordano Bruno burned alive for his daring thoughts that other worlds besides ours might be inhabited.

We see them ally themselves with kings, support rulers and tyrants, bless the immobile reaction of a whole continent and anyone strong enough to prevent the rising of the people. We see Popes fulminate against Voltaire, Rousseau, and all the French Encyclopædists, the Directory, Robespierre, and the French Revolution; disapprove of Volta and Galvani, the discoverer of electricity. We hear them reprobate the North American rebellion, interfere with the establishment of a free United States, attempt to retard the disruption of the Spanish Empire to prevent the emergence of the Latin-American Republics.

We see them help the return of the old despots after the fall of Napoleon, sneer at the universal demand for constitutional governments, try to strangle the principles of Liberalism, of Democracy, of free scientific inquiry, of political speculation; execrate the economic doctrines of Marx, the scientific theories of Darwin; oppose any reforms endangering the old order at the very time when the tracks of the first railways were ramifying from country to country, the first telegraph wires were humming from homes to offices, the first machines were multiplying in the great modern factories, the first motor-cars were appearing on the roads of Europe and of America, the first films were flickering on primitive screens in France, Marconi was transmitting his first wireless signals in Bologna, Italy, the Wright brothers were flying their first aeroplanes at Kittyhawk, Carolina, and that monstrous nightmare of all lovers of the past, a gargantuan industrialism, was

transforming a stagnant pastoral world into the thunderous society of today.

They intrigued during the Franco-Prussian War and the expansion of the British Commonwealth, during the rise of the Prussian Empire and the extension of Czarist Russia, during the rapid colonial race of the European nations, and the Russo-Japanese conflict, during the abortive Bolshevik revolution of Petrograd and the downfall of the Chinese Imperial colossus.

They witnessed the great European powers burst into the First World War, the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian, Turkish, German, and Russian Empires, the rise of the characteristic totalitarian political systems of the twentieth century, built upon the ashes of the thirty million dead and the frustration of the living.

They fought the establishment of Bolshevism in Russia, but negotiated with Lenin; they launched Catholic Parties, but helped the rise of Fascism in Italy; they condemned certain features of Nazism, but supported Hitler; and, during twenty years, by playing an ambiguous diplomacy, they encouraged the breaking of treaties, approved naked aggressions and the culmination of it all: the outbreak of the Second World War.

They tried to prevent the Fascist dictatorships from crashing, created new political parties, and set out to mobilize the West against a seemingly invincible foe, Communism, which continued to spread throughout the globe during the nightmare of the ever-darkening peace that followed the Second World War, the Cimmerian incubator of the third.

This, while only a short time before, at the Vatican, as in so many other capitals, the tremors of the first atomic bomb of Hiroshima had suddenly echoed, to herald the apocalyptic portents about to sweep upon a stunned twentieth century.

Yet, although with the first atomic flash a new era for mankind had begun, the Pope, surrounded by the shadows of all his predecessors, the silent witnesses of the rise and fall of races and civilizations, continued as impassively as ever to rule the Catholic masses, unshaken in his belief that the Church, as so often in the past, by meeting the new challenge would ultimately emerge the uncontested and sole ruler of the world of the future.

On what is such a belief erected?

It is erected on a monolithic certainty that the Papacy, as the visible incarnation of the claims of the Church, is not only indestructible but is destined to rule supreme above all nations and above all men. Consequently, as the fountainhead of all her majestic authority, the Papacy, by partaking of her indestructibility, becomes the receptacle of her spirit, of her mission, and of her will.

Everything within the Catholic Church, therefore, is subject to the Pope. Her spiritual dominion is centred in him, her ecclesiastical government revolves round him, her diplomatic and political power is represented by him. He is the pinnacle of an orderly hierarchy, the claimer of a massive subservience, the dispenser of an inflexible discipline. By uniting in his person the government of the Church as a religious institution, the machinery of the Vatican as a diplomatic centre, and the authority of a political potentate, the Pope has come to be the materialization of the intolerance, omnipotence, and absolutism of the Church.

The concentration of such tremendous might has made of the Popes leaders whose will to dominate knows no bounds, who plan to rule generations not yet conceived. All this in the certainty of the inevitable spiritual and political unity of all nations under the Roman Pontiff, the visible instrument of the Church's will.

As such, the Popes are endowed with all the attributes inherent in the Papacy, as the Papacy is endowed with those of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church's inflexible aim, the conversion and subjugation of the human race, having been entrusted to the Papacy, it follows that all the exertions of the Popes are directed towards achieving such a goal.

So the Pope, being the reflection of the Church, like the Church, cannot be on a par with anyone, admit any equal, or, even less, any superior. He must tower above institutions and men, as the Church must tower above all those who are within and outside her. As the Church is the only receptacle of truth, so the Pope is its sole defender. It is his duty to disperse its enemies, scatter opposition, and annihilate error. To accomplish this, he must have power; and to exercise power

he must be above all—above all the faithful, above all citizens; i.e. above both Church and State.

Hence a man, once elected Pope, in virtue of his office becomes the repository of the omnipotence of God. His faults and even crimes cannot stain the sanctity of his functions. His decisions, when he acts as the successor of St. Peter, emanate directly from the Divinity. Blind submission is due to him as to Christ Himself.

One of the greatest authorities on the Church had no doubts on the subject :

The Catholic Faith teaches, that every virtue is good, that every vice is bad. But if the Pope could err in commending vice, and forbidding virtues, the Church would be bound to believe that vices are good and that virtues are bad, unless she would sin against conscience.¹

The credence of the omnipotent irresponsibility of the Papacy was incorporated in the very Canon Law. Were a Pope so lost to the duties of his high station that through negligence he drew innumerable multitudes of the faithful with him to hell, he is not to be reprov'd by any man, for he is to judge mankind, and not to be judged by man; the nations are to pray to him, for on him their salvation depends, next to God.²

No Christian can ever presume to avoid obedience or, worse still, to refuse the ordinances of the Popes :

For . . . is it not recognized as miserable madness when the child endeavours to subdue the father, or the disciple his master, and to impose unjust conditions on him who is known to have the powers of binding and loosing him not only on Earth, but in Heaven? ³

The Pope, therefore, being above all men, is also above all rulers, whose lands and kingdoms he, as their supreme legislator, should govern :

The Pope can rule the kings and can govern the lords with stern laws, and he can command as many princes with hard decrees.⁴

The Pope is held to be not only the king of sovereigns and monarchs: he is more than a mortal being, and only a little less than God. This was not the opinion of the ignorant populace. It was that of responsible individuals :

You are not God, nor man;
but neither and between both,
whom God chose as partner;
born in companionship with
you He orders the world,
nor One Person did He will all things for Himself,
but He willed Earth and Heaven for Himself and you.⁵

If the Pope is second only to God, it follows that he partakes of the characteristics of the Divinity itself, and the medieval doctors could hardly find words to express such a credence adequately :

The Pope is not simply a man, but almost a God on Earth.⁶

As a creature exalted above all, therefore, the Pope is without equal. That means that if there is only one God in heaven, so there ought to be only one God on earth. And who might such a God be, if not the Pope?

As there is only one God in heaven, so there ought to be a God on earth. All Christians, therefore, should look upon the Pope as God Himself.⁷

Such an opinion was provoked neither by the blasphemous delirium of superstitious crowds nor by the self-seeking of highly placed flatterers. It was the open conviction of the Middle Ages. It is the firm conviction, although discreetly professed, of the Catholics of today. Indeed, it is the belief of the Popes themselves, and hence of the Church, as proved by one of the most famous of them, Innocent III, who in a sermon delivered on his own coronation had no hesitation in claiming the same for himself :

Now you may see who is the servant who is placed over the family of the Lord; truly is he the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the successor of Peter, the Christ of the Lord; placed in the middle between God and man, on this side of God, but beyond man; less than God, but greater than man; who judges all, but is judged by none.⁸

And when, on the same occasion, Innocent expressed his anxiety lest he should kill the souls that ought to enjoy eternal life, or give life to those which ought to die, one can measure the extent to which it was conceded that God had abnegated His power and had entrusted it to a mortal.

It will not surprise anybody that in the fourteenth century, when such opinions were current, the legal author of the *Richstich Landrecht*, while defining with jealous care the boundary between Papal and Secular legislation, added that the clergy claimed for the Pope the right to alter the doctrines of the Apostles, as "the Pope is bound by no forms of Law; his pleasure being the Law." Indeed, he could alter the decrees of the Almighty Himself, as testified by the belief, current throughout the Middle Ages, that Gregory the Great rescued the soul of the Roman Emperor Trajan from the eternal flames of hell simply by praying for him, a deed which has given no end of trouble to an infinite number of theologians and scholars ever since.

The Papal attributes were pushed even further and, as recently as last century, were made to infringe not only upon the law of men, but also upon the laws of right and wrong: "The Pope makes right of that which is wrong." This is not all. The Pope could alter the very course of nature: "The Pope can change the nature of things."⁹ Finally, words having become inadequate, the omnipotence of the Pope was typified by a dictum which, by openly defying human reason, expressed to the point of absurdity the unlimited power of the Popes:

The Pope is all and over all; he can change square things into round.¹⁰

This was written in the middle of the nineteenth, and, in its essence, is still accepted in the twentieth, century—not only by the subjects of the Pope, which would be worthy of the greatest censure, but by modern Popes themselves. Witness Pius XII, who, in 1949, speaking of himself, did not hesitate to declare to an audience of hundreds of thousands:

The Pope . . . is invincible and unshakable. He is the proclaimer of truth.¹¹

Nor was the arrogance of such claims confined to the rhetorical field. In the minds of uncountable generations these were real, concrete attributes, by virtue of which the Popes were able to erect an immense structure, thanks to which they could keep their iron grip upon the Middle Ages and beyond. They produced incommensurable repercussions,

not only within the Church, but also within the social, economic, and political framework of nations, causing immense reverberations throughout the Western world.

For the Popes did not content themselves with basking in the light of such glittering attributes; they acted upon them, on the assumption that, although less than God, they were truly beyond men, and therefore above all. The embodiment of civil authority—the councils ruling a town or republic, and the princes, kings, and emperors—were consequently subjects of the Popes, whom they had to acknowledge as their Lords in both religious and political matters:

The supreme Pontiff, *by divine right, has the fullest power over the whole world both* in ecclesiastical and in political matters.¹²

This became one of the most contested claims which the Popes tried to uphold against potentates and nations, employing all the spiritual and temporal power at their disposal, and which plunged Europe into endless wars and disasters.

The political Papal supremacy was not left to the spontaneous recognition of the secular rulers. It was pressed time and again by succeeding Popes throughout the centuries, in no uncertain terms and with such boldness that princes and kings more often than not could do nothing but bow, or pretend to bow, before the Papal assertion of Gregory VII that “the Pope stands to the Emperor as the sun to the moon.”

The most famous of such claims, however, is that made by Pope Boniface VIII, who, in his celebrated bull, *Unam Sanctam*, develops the classic idea of the two swords. According to this conception, God has ordained two principalities on earth, typified by the secular sword and the spiritual sword, those of Kingship and Papacy. But of these two swords the lower is in subordination to the higher, King is under Pope, “temporal authority is subject to the spiritual.” Hence the secular sword must be wielded for the Church’s progress whenever the Roman Pontiff invokes it. As an outward sign of this, Boniface was always preceded by two swords, carried before him as symbols of the Pope’s dual majesty.

The authority of secular rulers does not derive from the citizens but from the Church, declared Innocent IV. That of kings and emperors, therefore, is not theirs, but belongs to the

Church, from whom they have borrowed it with her consent :

Secular rulers, exercising their authority, are only using a power which has been transferred to them, and which remains latent and potential in the bosom of the Church.¹³

In virtue of this, they claimed to depose and enthrone rulers, kings, and emperors at will, on the ground that if the Popes could "bind and loose in heaven, so also they could take away and grant kingdoms, principalities, and all other possessions of men."¹⁴

Popes not only issued encyclicals on the subject, but wrote directly to kings and emperors, pressing the Papal assertions. Clement V, first of the Avignon Popes, for instance, thus referred to a sentence passed by a king on a vassal of the Roman See :

We annul it in virtue of the *incontestable supremacy* which the Holy See possesses over the Empire . . . and by that plenitude of power which the successor of St. Peter has received from Jesus Christ, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.¹⁵

Very often they commanded kings to resign their power and to submit their claims to the Holy Pontiff, bringing against them the whole vast machinery of secular society if they dared to disregard the Papal command. Gregory VII deposed the Emperor, Henry IV, absolving all his subjects from their allegiance. Pope John XXII ordered the competitors for the Imperial crown, Frederick of Austria and Louis of Bavaria, "to resign all power and submit their claims" to him. Upon their refusal, the Pope declared the throne vacant, confirmed the nomination of Robert of Naples as Imperial Vicar, demanded that all who held office by appointment of the late emperor should resign under pain of excommunication and interdict, and in 1323 absolved all subjects of Louis of Bavaria from their allegiance. A similar thing happened to King John of England, whom Innocent III deposed, declaring *him and his posterity for ever* incapable of occupying the English throne.

If the Popes claimed to be supreme over kings and emperors, it followed that they extended such supremacy to any other

authorities, from the most exalted to the lowest; which enabled them to rend the whole structure of society from top to bottom, whenever it pleased them. They repeated such claims throughout the Middle Ages. An extract from the bull issued by Pope Paul IV, as late as 1559, is a typical example :

Since, by reason of the office of the Apostolate to us divinely entrusted, the general cure of the flock of the Lord devolves to us . . . the Roman Pontiff, who is vice-regent of God the Lord Jesus Christ upon earth, having plenitude of powers over nations and kingdoms, judging all and being judged by none . . . decree that all persons whatsoever . . . be they Counts, Barons, Marquis, Dukes, Kings and Emperors, who hitherto shall be found of deviating from the faith . . . shall *ipso facto*, without any process or law or proof of fact, be deprived of their dignities as Counts, Barons, Marquis, Dukes, Kings and Emperors, altogether and absolutely, and shall be in future held to be disqualified . . . to be rehabilitated in their Duchies, Kingdoms and Empires.¹⁶

Such decrees made thrones fall and whole nations change their rulers or even become fiefs of the Roman Pontiffs.

The pretensions of the Popes were not confined to the times when they towered aloft with all the pride and arrogance of rulers whose nods were laws. The Popes maintained them even after their power had been much reduced and, indeed, in many lands nullified altogether by the appearance of Protestantism. They threatened Protestant potentates with the same boldness, and although, more often than not, their commands were in vain, yet they were ominous of the unchanged claims of the Catholic Church.

The bull which Pope Pius V wrote against Elizabeth of England in 1570 was a characteristic example :

He that reigneth on high [he thundered in it], to whom is given all the power in Heaven and in Earth, hath committed the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, *out of which there is no salvation*, to one alone on Earth, namely to Peter, prince of the apostles, and to the Roman Pontiff, successor of Peter, to be governed with a plenitude of power; *this one he hath constituted Prince over all nations, and all kingdoms*, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruin, plant and build.

The bull was not a vain threat. It summoned the great Spanish Armada to the invasion of England.

As the lordship of the Pope is not limited to one group of

the faithful, but extends to all members of the Church, as well as to all members of society, so in the same way his supremacy extends not only over one single nation or group of nations, but over all nations of Christendom. That is to say, the Popes claim to be supreme over the whole of the Western World :

It is notorious that Constantine thought that he to whom God had confided the care of heavenly things should rule earthly things [wrote Pope Gregory IX to the Emperor Frederick II, in October, 1236]. Therefore he gave in perpetuity to the Roman Pontiff the imperial sceptre and insignia, with Rome and all its province, and the empire itself, considering it infamous that in the place where the head of the Christian religion had been stationed by the heavenly sovereign, an earthly sovereign should exercise any power.

This, however, was not enough. For as only the truth has the right to rule, and as the truth is to be found only in Christianity, and since its sole repository is the Catholic Church, so it follows that, as its head, the Pope ought to be acknowledged also in those lands where the Christian religion is not practised : that is to say, all over the world :

Constantine, to whom belonged universal monarchy [went on Pope Gregory IX], wished that the Vicar of Christ and Prince of Apostles . . . should also possess the government of corporeal things in the whole world.

Such claims were not theoretical. They were real, and had profound repercussions in the history of the West.

The Popes of the Middle Ages attempted to erect a veritable empire upon them. Pope Innocent III, for instance (1198-1216), thundered that it was his right to exert temporal supremacy over all the crowns of Christendom. For, as the successor of St. Peter, he was simultaneously the supreme head of the only true religion and the temporal sovereign of the universe. By the end of his reign he had made the Papacy the temporal ruler of Naples, of the islands of Sicily and Sardinia, of almost all the States of the Iberian peninsula, such as Castille, Leon, Navarre, Aragon, of Portugal, of what are now Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, of the Kingdom of Hungary, of the Slav States of Bohemia, of Serbia, of Bosnia, of Bulgaria, and of Poland. Also, it became *de facto* and *de jure* sovereign of England and of Ireland, after having com-

pelled King John of England to pay a yearly tribute, *in token of the subjection of England and Ireland*. Innocent III made himself also the temporal ruler of the Christian States founded in Syria. Indeed, he went further, and during the Crusades of 1202 he planned nothing less than the annexation to the Papacy of the Byzantine Empire. A Latin dominion came into being in the East, and, while the Byzantines became the temporal vassals of the Pope, the whole of the Greek Orthodox Church was compelled to acknowledge Roman religious and political supremacy.

Even this was not all. The Popes claimed to be the only true temporal sovereigns of all the islands of the seas. In virtue of this Pope Hadrian IV granted the English king the hereditary lordship of Ireland, with a ring as symbol of investiture, conferring on him dominion over the island, which, "like all Christian Islands, belonged of right to St. Peter and to the Roman Church."¹⁷

Basing their rights upon this, the Popes went further, and claimed as their property all the islands and lands as yet undiscovered. In this way they disposed of nothing less than the Americas.

Their exertions, directed at shaping the future of the New World, have a significance transcending mere historical speculations. The fact that they did not succeed in disposing of it as they wished should not minimize the importance of their attempt. For it must be remembered that they did not succeed simply because they were prevented from doing so. But what would have happened had they been permitted to brand the whole of the Western Hemisphere with Papal omnipotence? World history would have been made to turn in an entirely different direction.

The discovery of America represents the most far-reaching revolution ever accomplished in the history of man. It shifted in its entirety the centre of gravity of the then known world, and consequently the character of our contemporary society. Had the Popes succeeded in directing it, it is no exaggeration to say that certain great nations—for instance the United States—would never have been permitted to see the light. This is not a conjecture, it is a certainty. For the Popes from the first, were clearly determined that the whole

of the Americas be apportioned *only* to Catholic powers; indeed, that only Catholics be permitted to settle in the New World. In 1493, only one year after the discovery of America, Pope Alexander VI, as sole legal owner of all the Islands of the Oceans, granted the New World to King Ferdinand, proclaiming that all lands discovered or to be discovered west of a line one hundred leagues beyond the Azores belonged to Catholic Spain. Here are the relevant words in this astonishing document:

Alexander Bishop, the Servant of the Servants of God, to our most beloved Son in Christ, King Ferdinando . . .

We are credibly informed, that whereas of late you were determined to seek and find certain Islands and firm lands, far remote and unknown . . . you have appointed our well beloved son Christopher Columbus . . . to seek (by the Sea, where hitherto no man hath sailed) such firm lands and Islands far remote, and hitherto unknown . . .

We greatly commending this your godly and laudable purpose . . . We of our own motion, and by the fulness of Apostolical power, *do give, grant and assign to you, your heirs, and successors, all the firm lands and Islands, found or to be found, discovered or to be discovered towards the West and South, drawing a line from the Pole Arctic to the Pole Antarctic (that is) from the North to the South: Containing in this Donation whatsoever firm Land or Islands are found or to be found . . .*

Towards India, or towards any other part whatsoever it be, being distant from, or without the foresaid Line, drawn a hundred leagues towards the West, and South, from any of the Islands which are commonly called, De Los Azores and Capo Verde.

All the Islands therefore, and firm Lands, found and to be found, discovered and to be discovered, from the said Line towards the West and South, such as have not actually been heretofore possessed by any other Christian King or Prince, until the day of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ last past . . .¹⁸

Following this with a second bull, the Pope added that all islands and mainlands whatsoever found and to be found . . . in sailing or travelling towards the West or South,

should also belong to Spain.

When the Popes did not directly apportion the planet, they did it indirectly via their secular instruments, the Catholic nations. Thus, after Catholic Spain there followed Catholic Portugal, and in 1494 the Treaty of Tordesillas moved the

Papal line of demarcation to the meridian three hundred and seventy leagues west of the Azores. This resulted in yet another visible effect of Papal will upon the contemporary world: the existence of Portuguese Brazil. For the pushing of the line so far west caused a great part of the soon-to-be-discovered Brazilian bulge to be included in the Portuguese dominions.

The New World was legally the absolute property of the Papacy. Hence only the subjects of the Popes were to be permitted to settle there. Immediately the earliest portion of American soil was colonized—i.e. the Island of Santo Domingo, one of those visited by Columbus on his first voyage—the Popes, acting via their “vassal,” the most Catholic King of Spain, decreed that no converted Jews, Moors, or heretics, but only *Catholic Christians*, might inhabit, settle in, or *even visit* the New World.

When Balboa crossed the Isthmus of Panama and discovered the Pacific Ocean, a Catholic priest who was a member of the expedition rushed into the waves with a crucifix, shouting: “I take possession of this ocean in the name of Jesus Christ!”—and hence in the name of the Pope, the Pope being His representative on earth.

Pope Leo, long after feudalism had passed away, upheld as intransigently as ever the conception of earth-ownership, which has clung to the Papal mind more firmly than ever since the occasion when, not as arbiter in any dispute, but as a *world suzerain*, he granted to the King of Portugal permission to possess all kingdoms and islands of the Far East, which he had wrested from the infidel, and all that he would in future thus acquire, even if up to that time *unknown and undiscovered*.

The destiny of the Americas and of Asia took a different course from that charted by the Pope, as the Papal will was soon to be infringed by rebellious and impatient nations. Yet, because destiny had decreed that Papal arrogance be stultified by the future, to believe that the monarchic claims of the Roman Pontiffs are events of no import, even if glowing still, in the hallucinatory halls of history, with the sinister radiance and mellowed aura of the centuries, would be to commit a most grievous error.

Papal assertions are not buried under the dusty grandeur of

a half-forgotten past. They are as unmodified, as unchanged, and as unaltered as ever.

Today, perhaps even more than when the Hildebrands and the Gregories were making the thrones of the West rock to their foundations, they have been transmuted into the most powerful inspirers of that unrelenting Papal imperialism which, armed with all the dumb malevolence of a pernicious institution basking in the prestige of antiquity, thrives with callous, vulturine deadliness upon the panicky desperation of contemporary man. Indeed, which is patiently biding its time to erect once more its ancient standards and to distribute its chief forces throughout the earth, in its vampiric determination to coerce mankind into ultimate unmitigated universal submission when, before the astonished nations, the Popes may be owned anew the masters of the world.

4

PAPAL PROMOTION OF CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS SUPERSTITION FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

ONCE THE POPES HAD ASSERTED THEIR supremacy over the whole world, it was but a short step to claim universal supremacy over all its inhabitants. This claim was repeated and acted upon by numerous Pontiffs for centuries. Indeed, it became one of the foundation stones of the Catholic Church throughout the Middle Ages, and remains the foundation stone of the Catholic Church *today*. The exertions of Catholicism are based upon it. All the activities of the Catholic Church as a religious institution and of the Vatican as a political one have been and are still inspired by it.

The Popes, in fact, declare that no man can be saved unless he is a member of the Church—that is to say, a subject of the Pope. Innocent IV published an encyclical in which, after having asserted that the Pope has sovereign dominion over the whole world, he stated :

The Popes have received sovereignty not only Pontifical but royal, and the Empire not only of heaven but of Earth. . . . Outside the Church

there is no building save Hell, and there exists no power ordained by God. . . .¹

While another Pope boldly declared :

The Roman Pontiff, constituted by God above Kings and Kingdoms, is the supreme hierarch of the Church militant, and *has obtained* principality over all mortal men.²

But where the Papacy surpassed itself in its claim to universal rulership over all mankind was in the dogmatic definition given by one of its most formidable Popes, Boniface VIII, who, in one of the most famous documents of Catholicism, explicitly asserted that no human being could be saved unless he were a subject of the Pope :

We declare, define, establish and decree that *every human creature*, under the rigid necessity of saving his soul, *must be subject to the Roman Pontiff*.³

Are these only the teachings of the Popes of the Middle Ages? Not at all. These are the doctrines of the Popes of the last and of the present century. Indeed, the modern Popes, far from discarding such claims, have solemnly added others no less incredible.

The modern Popes, in fact, have in addition declared themselves the direct mouthpieces of God and, like God, infallible. The relevant words of the definition of their infallibility, uttered in 1870, read :

. . . We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra* . . . that is, when in the discharge of his office of pastor and teacher of *all Christians* . . . is . . . possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that the Church should be endowed in defining doctrine *regarding faith or morals*; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiffs are (of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church) irreformable.⁴

The modern Popes, it should be noticed, declare themselves infallible as the teachers, not of all Catholics, but of *all Christians*. Consequently, in their eyes, all Protestants and all Orthodox still owe them allegiance.

The Popes today, by claiming more forcibly than even their predecessors that all baptized individuals are their subjects, assert with unheard-of arrogance that all Protestants must look upon them as their teachers and their masters. This is an

infallible utterance, and must be accepted as such. All Protestants, therefore, must believe what the Pope teaches. For instance, that the Virgin Mary ascended bodily into heaven. Is this against the credence of the Bible, of Christianity, or of human reasoning? The Pope has spoken. It is the truth.

Should anyone refuse to accept it, Papal omnipotence is threatened against him. Today, such omnipotence cannot openly delegate a docile secular arm or the Holy Inquisition. Modern society has seen to it that such proceedings be discarded. But the Pope still has the full exercise of his powers. And although to non-Catholics they might sound hollow—and, indeed, non-existent, deprived as they have been of their ancient physical coercion—yet the fact remains that Papal fulminations are still directed against them with the same arrogance as of old.

On November 1, 1950, Pope Pius XII, standing on the steps of St. Peter's, in Rome, before a crowd of 700,000 convened there from all over the world, after having proclaimed that the belief that the Virgin Mary ascended bodily into heaven became a dogma from that moment onwards, because he said so, ended the reading of the Papal Bull with a solemn threat.

No one may be permitted to violate this, our declaration, proclamation, and definition, or to *oppose* or to transgress it,

were his actual words.

If anyone should dare to attempt this, let him know that he will incur the indignation of God Almighty.

The power of the Papacy has been broken. But the spirit of dominion is still there, as living, as intransigent, and as combative as ever. Far from being dead, it is dynamically active, screened by the mantle of religion, often unrecognized, but feverishly engaged with schemes of great import to the life of all nations. For the Pope now has put forward even more dangerous claims. He has decreed himself to be as infallible as God when he defines doctrines, not only on "faith," but also on "morals." The field of morals is boundless. It embraces practically all the activities of our contemporary society. Divorce is a moral question: the Pope's pronouncements upon it, therefore, are infallible. But divorce, although primarily a moral issue, is equally a paramount social one.

Consequently, the Pope indirectly claims infallibility also in social questions. But are not social questions the begetters of practically all political problems? Hence Papal infallibility reverberating even further and affecting the political life of the modern world.

No wonder the various nations of the West, when the Vatican began to take the first ominous steps which were to lead to the declaration of Papal infallibility, agitated with a view to taking measures to prevent the Vatican from issuing such a dogma, on the score that the Papacy was seeking to establish a temporal overlordship in the West.⁵

But this is not yet enough.

The Popes claim the rulership of, in addition to this planet, the next life. In virtue of the power of the keys, they say they can lock or unlock the gates of hell, commit individuals, communities, and whole generations either to its eternal flames or to the splendour of heaven.

They are lords, not only of the bodies, but also of the souls of men; not only of their present, but also of their future, both in this and in the world to come.

More, the Popes have jurisdiction in heaven itself. The heavenly hosts—indeed, their very angelic leaders—must bow to their decrees. Fantastic theological aberrations of some Pontiff of the darkest Middle Ages? By no means. Just a routine claim of the Popes of the twentieth century. Such Papal omnipotence, in fact, to the incredulity of the cynics—and no less, one feels sure, to the astonishment of the angelic being concerned—was exercised by Pope Pius XII, when, by means of a Papal Brief issued on April 2, 1951, he officially promoted the Archangel Gabriel to the rank of supreme supervisor of all the telephones and telephonists, television sets and television fans, of the world.⁶

The promotion of Gabriel to such a lofty position might be a cause for mirth to many, for scandal to Protestants, and for embarrassment to some Catholics. Yet the Pope's power to mobilize religious superstition should not be lightly dismissed. For he can still make it yield political results of the gravest consequence in this our atomic era.

One of the most striking instances, for cunning unmatched by even the Popes of the Middle Ages, has been given by Pius XII.

Pius XII, in addition to the laurels gathered as a super-diplomat and arch political tactician, since his coronation successfully added new ones—those of an extra-holy being. Unlike any one of his predecessors he did that simply by sanctifying himself through the manufacture of a miracle and by asking all the faithful to believe that God had favoured him with special direct messages from heaven. Slandorous fable? Fantastic invention of anti-Catholic minds? Not at all. Official statement of the Catholic Church herself. Here is the official version of it:

On the afternoon of October 30, 1950, at 4 p.m., "the Holy Father turned his gaze from the Vatican gardens to the sun, and there there was renewed for his eyes the prodigy of the Valley of Fatima." And what was the prodigy? ". . . He was able to witness the life of the sun [a huge sphere 866,000 miles in diameter] under the hand of Mary. The sun was agitated, all convulsed, transformed into a picture of life; in a spectacle of celestial movements; *in transmission of mute but eloquent messages* to the Vicar of Christ."⁷

This did not occur once, but on three successive days: October 30, 31, and November 1, 1950.

The news of this astounding miracle, with its "eloquent messages to the Vicar of Christ" direct from heaven, was solemnly announced on October 13, 1951, to a monster gathering of one million people convened at Fatima, Portugal, by none less than a cardinal specifically sent there by Pius XII himself.⁸

The significance of this event and of the direct message to the Pope, however, cannot be properly appreciated unless the full significance of Fatima is understood. Fatima, a desolate locality in Portugal, became a shrine when, in 1917, the year of the Russian Revolution, the Virgin Mary appeared repeatedly, with a momentous message, to three illiterate children. The apparition was accompanied by a somewhat irregular occurrence. "After a few moments of brilliant sunshine, the sun became pale, three times it turned speedily on itself like a Catherine-wheel, sending forth rays of the fairest

colours of the rainbow. At the end of these convulsive revolutions it seemed to jump out of its orbit and come towards the people in a zigzag course, stopped, and returned again to its normal position."⁹ This, it should be noted, was seen also by a large crowd near the children and "lasted twelve minutes."

Neither in 1917 nor in 1950 did the two billion human beings see anything odd in the earth's luminary. The astronomers also remained strangely mute. And ninety-three million miles away the sun continued to plunge with its planetary system along the immensities of the universe, just as if the three simple Portuguese children or the most astute of modern Popes had never seen it agitate, rotate, and, indeed, "jump out of its orbit."

Yet masses of Catholics came to believe that the sun had truly moved towards the people "in a zigzag course," behaving in that most unastronomical fashion as a concrete proof of the authenticity of the divine message delivered to the three children in 1917 and to the Pope in 1950.

The Virgin Mary had been very specific about what had motivated her first to appear and then to make the sun "jump out of its orbit." She had done that to induce the Pope to bring about "the consecration of the world" to her "immaculate heart," followed by "the consecration of Russia." "If people attend to my petition," the Virgin Mary had continued, "Russia will be converted, and there will be peace." But, she warned, were this not accomplished, then "her [Russia's] errors will spread throughout the world, causing wars and persecutions . . . different nations will be destroyed." In the end, however, the Virgin promised, by way of consolation, the Catholic Church would triumph, after which "the Holy Father will consecrate Russia to me." Thereupon "she [Russia] shall be converted, and a period of peace will be granted to the world."

These quotations are from the authenticated message of the Virgin Mary, as related to one of the children, and fully accepted by the Catholic Church as a genuine revelation of the Mother of God.¹⁰

This became the essence of the divine tidings. Within a few years the new cult had developed into one of the most success-

ful of the Catholic Church. And, curiously enough, its importance grew parallel with the equally rapid intensification of the anti-Communist crusade, promoted by the Vatican.

The number of pilgrims grew from 60 on June 13, 1917, to 60,000 in October of that same year. From 144,000 in 1923 to 588,000 in 1928.¹¹ In 1929 Pope Pius XI, after sealing an official alliance with Mussolini, the first modern Fascist dictator to be brought in on the crest of an anti-Bolshevik wave, granted official approval to the new cult. In 1932, while German Nazis were careering to power on the strength of the same anti-Red policy, the Vatican reinforced the cult by sending none other than a Papal Nuncio to Fatima. In 1936, when Catholic Franco launched the civil war against the legal but "Red" Spanish Government, the novel cult of Fatima received a further impetus. By 1938 two-thirds of Europe had been already Fascistized and, to a great extent, "Fatima-ized." European "Fatima-ization," however, had been restricted to a rather small circle of believers. In view of the possibility and, indeed, the near certainty of an oncoming attack against Soviet Russia, it became necessary to mobilize not only the Fascist armies, but also something far more potent than any anti-Communist leader could offer: promotion of ideological odium via religious emotionalism. This could be done by a further intensification of the cult of Fatima.

It was thus that, at this juncture, the Vatican sprang its second, most important master-stroke. This consisted in heightening even further the mystical facet of the phenomenon of Fatima by bringing into it the essence of mystery, a most necessary ingredient of individual and organized superstition in ancient and modern times.

The result was that in May, 1938, almost half a million pilgrims convened at Fatima. These were informed—or, rather, reminded—that the Virgin Mary had originally confided three great secrets to the children, but that at the same time the Virgin had strictly forbidden that they be disclosed to anyone. The psychological tension had been created and with it the mood for a favourable reception of anything that might lead to the disclosure of the three great divine mysteries. Then—notice the timing—in June the only surviving child, acting on the advice of her confessor, constantly in direct contact

with the Head of the Portuguese hierarchy, revealed to her bishop two of the three great secrets confided to her by the Mother of Christ.

The first was the vision of hell, which certainly did not disclose anything new to modern man.

The second was more to the point: a reiteration that Soviet Russia would be converted to Catholicism, as already seen.

The third was given sealed and is in the custody of ecclesiastical authority. It will not be revealed until 1960.

With this dramatic revelation, or rather reiteration, of the second secret, Fatima swiftly assumed a tremendous new religious and political significance. The shrine became overnight the most serious competitor of the French Lourdes, the then topmost miracle-manufacturer of Catholic worship. The timing of the revelation could not have been better chosen. The following year, 1939, the Second World War broke out. In June, 1941, Hitler invaded Soviet Russia. The Virgin's prophecy was being fulfilled to the letter. Catholic volunteers joined the Nazi armies from Italy, France, Ireland, Belgium, Holland, Latin America, the U.S.A., and Portugal. Spain sent her Blue Division. Many of the volunteers went to fight the Soviets, prompted by ideological hatred, but most by their desire to become the chosen instruments for the fulfilment of the Fatima prophecy.

In October, 1941, while the Nazi Army rolled towards Moscow, Pius XII, speaking to Portugal, urged Catholics to pray for the speedy realization of the Lady of Fatima's promises. The following year, 1942, after a speech by Hitler in which the Fuehrer had declared that Soviet Russia had definitely been defeated, Pope Pius XII, in a Jubilee message over the radio, fulfilled the first injunction of the Virgin, and "consecrated the whole world" to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

Catholic hierarchies declared that the new era predicted by the Mother of God had arrived: "We believe that the apparitions of Fatima open a new era," wrote Cardinal Cerejeira in the same year. "It is the foreshadowing of what the Immaculate Heart of Mary is preparing for the whole world." The new era in 1942 was a totally Nazified European Continent, with Soviet Russia seemingly wiped off the map for

good, Japan conquering half of Asia, and World Fascism at its zenith everywhere.

The Fascist Empire vanished with the collapse of the Fascist nations. In 1945 the Second World War ended. And Soviet Russia emerged as the second greatest power on earth.

The cult of Fatima, with the receding fortunes of the Nazi armies, had, curiously enough, suffered a parallel devotional recess. Only a few months after the end of the war, however, it was suddenly revived, and in October, 1945, after a briefing from Vatican City, monster pilgrimages were once more organized by the sundry hierarchies of Europe.

The following year Our Lady of Fatima was solemnly crowned, before a gathering of 500,000 people, with a golden crown weighing 1,200 grammes, with 313 pearls, 1,400 diamonds, and 1,250 other precious stones. Pius XII, after having told them by radio that the message of Fatima would be fulfilled, exhorted them to make ready. "There can be no neutrals, but only one hundred per cent Catholics," he said. Therefore, "never step back," but "line up as crusaders."¹²

In 1947 the "cold war" was initiated. The Vatican promoted the religious-ideological side of it with mounting admonitions to the Catholic world. A statue of Our Lady of Fatima, with her message, was sent on "pilgrimage" from country to country, to arouse anti-Communist odium. The statue was received with immense religious fervour wherever it went, being welcomed not only by the sundry Catholic hierarchies but very often by whole governments as well. Within a few years it had travelled over fifty-two nations in Europe, Asia, Africa, the Americas, and Australia. Simultaneously, the U.S.A., having put herself at the head of anti-Communist forces the world over, set out to mobilize anti-Communist armies, and the East-West split continued to widen.

About 1948 a frightful American-Russian atomic armaments race began. In 1949 Pope Pius XII, to strengthen the anti-Bolshevik ideological unity of the West, excommunicated any Catholic belonging to or supporting the Communists. And soon afterwards American Catholic theologians began to tell America that it was her duty to use atom bombs to save the West from Communism.¹³

Then Our Lady of Fatima appeared once more. This time on the other side of the world, where the anti-Communist front needed solidification—to a nun in the Philippines. And, during fifteen new Asiatic visits, she once more reiterated her warning against Communism. After which a shower of fragrant rose petals fell at the nun's feet as a token of the reality of these celestial visits. An American Jesuit¹⁴ took the miraculous petals back to the U.S.A., where he used them to fire with renewed energy the anti-Communist efforts of fanatical American Catholics, among these, "character assassin" Senator McCarthy, and rosary-kissing Senator McCarran.

In January, 1950, the duplicate of the original statue of Fatima, which Bishop Da Silva had blessed in 1947—following the encouragement of Pope Pius XII and the approval of the American Ambassador in Moscow, Admiral Kirk, subsequently Chairman of the "American Committee for the Liberation of the People of Russia"—was taken by plane to Moscow by Fr. Arthur Brassard, an American, and placed in the church of the foreign diplomats, there to await the "imminent liberation of Soviet Russia." The imminent liberation of Russia was not to be accomplished by angels, but by American bombers, as testified by certain American generals—e.g. General Grow, appointed U.S. military attaché in the Russian capital in July, 1950. To destroy Soviet Russia "anything, truth or falsehood," was good, said General Grow. Therefore "we must start by hitting [Russia] below the belt." That is to say, the U.S.A. must start a war. "War, as soon as possible. Now!" became the General's slogan.

During that same summer, while Americans took statues of Our Lady of Fatima to Moscow, blood-thirsty American generals asked for "War. Now!", and American ambassadors were promoting Committees for the Liberation of Soviet Russia. Mr. Matthew, a Privy Chamberlain of the Pope, but in his official capacity none other than the Secretary of the American Navy, shocked Europe and the world by publicly asking for a "preventive atomic war" to liberate Soviet Russia.¹⁵

American Catholic theologians came to the fore, humbly eager to help the fulfilment of the promise of Fatima, and

assured the U.S.A. that they could use the hydrogen bomb without bothering about their conscience, provided they used it against the Soviets.¹⁶

Simultaneously Blue Armies, pledging themselves to fulfil the request of Our Lady, were organized. The Fatima soldiers did daily penance in reparation, said the rosary, wore a scapular, and, above all, did all in their power to oppose Communism, help those who were fighting it, and support any individual, organization, nation, or group of nations to liberate Russia from Bolshevism as the first step towards the incorporation of that country into the Catholic Church. By the end of the year 800,000 people had enrolled in the Blue Army in the U.S.A. alone.

In 1951 the largest pilgrimage ever organized convened at Fatima, by now the undisputed top shrine of Catholicism. The third stepping-stone to the ideological magnification of the message was laid, with all the emotional superstitious allurements of which the Catholic Church was capable. As we have already seen, a cardinal, the special representative of the Pope, told the million listeners that "another person has seen this same miracle. He saw it outside Fatima; he saw it years later; he saw it at Rome. . . . The Pope, the same our Pontiff Pius XII, he saw it!"¹⁷

One week later the President of the U.S.A. stunned America by designating the first American Ambassador to the Vatican, General Mark Clark, a personal friend of Pius XII, and, more ominous still, Chief of the American Army Field Forces (October 21, 1951).

Ten days later (November 1, 1951) atom bombs of a new type were exploded in the Nevada desert, in the first atom warfare manœuvre in history in which troops were stationed near the atomic burst.

The personal friend of Pope Pius XII, the first American Ambassador-designate to the Vatican, General Mark Clark, was one of the leading military men directing the atomic manœuvre. Atomic warfare, with all the horrors it involved, had been initiated.

Almost simultaneously another no less important American personage got a new assignment—Mr. George Kennan, designated as new U.S. Ambassador to Moscow. The designa-

tion was more than ominous. Mr. Kennan was the architect of the Truman-Acheson "containment policy," specifically directed against Soviet Russia, around which the whole American policy of colossal rearmament was revolving. But, more portentous still, the new American Ambassador to Moscow was none other than the head of the "Free Russia Committee," a body, as its name implied, set up to promote the liberation of Russia from Communism. Prominent among its American members: leading figures of the American Catholic Church, ardent devotees of Fatima, and big names in Finance and the giant Corporations.

At the same time almost four million copies of an American magazine flooded the U.S.A. and many bookstalls of Europe. The whole issue of 130 pages was dedicated to the coming atomic war against Soviet Russia. War against Russia, it was declared, would begin in 1952. Russia, it predicted, would be defeated and occupied. After the "liberation," which would occur in 1955, while Czarism would be reinstalled and the economic reconstruction would be handed over to the Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Trusts, complete religious freedom would be proclaimed.¹⁸

The "conversion" of Russia, as predicted by the Virgin Mary, would thus have become a reality when the third secret would be revealed by the Church in 1960.¹⁹ Russia, now under the spiritual care of the Pope, would become a Catholic nation, and peace would bless the world for decades to come.

Catholics had been making special prayers for just this since 1947, when Catholic hierarchies openly urged the faithful to special devotions to Our Lady of Fatima, to induce her to carry out a speedy fulfilment of her promise. These special prayers were not only chanted in the West; they were whispered with understandable caution even in Communist countries. In Eastern Europe the churches "were filled with people praying for a war of liberation." Western Catholics understood and approved. "There is something shocking about praying for war," was the comment of a leading Catholic organ, "but we shall not understand contemporary history if we forget that this is what millions of good Christians are doing."²⁰

To foster Catholic zeal for a "war of liberation," the Vatican did not rely solely on the power of prayers. To

strengthen these with the blindest fanaticism of superstition it went to lengths that could not be believed, were they not true. A few months after the announcement of Pius XII's "miracle," owing to the unpublicized embarrassment of not a few Catholics, particularly in Protestant countries, not to mention the sneers of nominal but sceptical ones in Catholic lands, the *Osservatore Romano* related, with all its massive official authority, how the Pope had truly witnessed "a miracle of the sun," referred to by Cardinal Tedeschini when he told the story at Fatima, Portugal, on October 13, 1951.

We live in an age when even Catholics—a very tiny minority of them, it must be admitted—sometimes get impatient and ask for proofs. The *Osservatore Romano* is an organ which is celebrated throughout the world, particularly in certain capitals such as Washington, for its veracity, matter-of-fact, trustworthy news, and factual, sober comment and grasp of concrete situations.

The *Osservatore* was once more true to its reputation. And the Pope's newspaper published on its front page two "rigorously authentic" photographs showing the prodigy of Fatima on October 13, 1917. The captions were even more matter-of-fact: "At 12 o'clock the vision began. At twenty minutes past 12 the rainy weather cleared up, and soon afterwards a voice cried: "Look at the sun!"

The two "authentic" photographs clearly show the black spot in the sun, caused by the rapid whirling, and the position reached by the sun itself, almost level with the horizon, although the photographs were taken at 12.30 p.m. "This position," commented the sober *Osservatore*, "would have been absolutely impossible at the hour when the pictures were taken, at 12.30 p.m."

The sun, in other words, was on the horizon when it should have been where any well-behaved sun is at any ordinary, common noon. An even greater miracle, which, however, the *Osservatore*, having no proofs, did not mention, was that, apart from the photographer, the rest of mankind never noticed the sun falling on to the horizon at noon on October 13, 1917.

The *Osservatore* then recalled "another surprising fact" which occurred at the Vatican thirty years later—"At the

time when the entire Catholic family was rejoicing, in union with the Vicar of Jesus Christ, in the dogmatic definition of Our Lady's Assumption into heaven." The Papal organ has always been sober of words, particularly if the events it reports are supported by "rigorously authentic" photographs. In a curt, authoritative summing up, commented the *Osservatore*: "It is not our task to draw deductions from these singularly analogous events"—notice its humility and its caution—"but Our Lady's interventions frequently happen in the gravest days of the Church's history, even with signs directed *personally* to the successor of Peter." 21

The "signs directed personally to the successor of Peter," however, to the sceptical were of a more earthly, matter-of-fact, and tragic character. Pius XII had played no mean role in their promotion. In February, 1951, in a Lenten eve message, he made an ominous comparison of the present with the fourth-century "barbaric invasion," alluding to the menace of Soviet Russia,

when the barbarians' invasion of the Roman Empire brought to Rome the germs of a rapid decadence with unbelievable suffering. Is there not a similarity between these conditions of that time and the present?

he asked. Thereupon he concluded his message by exhorting Catholic priests and laymen "to multiply their efforts to exterminate the germs of a rapid decadence threatening the modern world, as they did at the time of St. Augustine." 22

Soon afterwards, the most spineless dummies of the Holy See—e.g. the Portuguese, Spanish, Latin-American, and Italian hierarchies—reiterated the same message, stressing the parallel of the "barbaric invasion," and, like the Pope, pointing at Soviet Russia.

The danger of the "barbaric invasion" was stressed with equal urgency also in Protestant countries—e.g. England and Australia. In the latter, the Australian hierarchy came out with a formidable document, hailed by the Australian government, directed to all Catholics in Asia, which referred to the "barbaric invasion" of Asian Communism and urged them to be ready. 23

The American hierarchy became no less anxious, and, taking for an excuse the moral corruption of the U.S.A., they, too,

stressed the fact of the U.S.A. and the world being threatened by a "barbaric invasion," similar to that which destroyed the Roman Empire 1,500 years ago. "The problems of that Empire closely resemble those which sorely test us now; barbarism on the outside, refined materialism within." ²⁴

Pius XII's warning of the forthcoming "barbarian invasion" from the East was not mere rhetoric. It was the colourful wrapper of a colossal promotion of religious mass superstition directed at fostering ideological fanaticism via the cult of Fatima, the miracle of the whirling sun, and the divine messages to the Pope direct from heaven, as the complementary aid to the diplomatic, political, and, above all, military activities which, meanwhile, had been set in operation throughout the West.

The general of the American Army, on the active list, who had been designated ambassador to the Vatican, had been assigned there "to assist co-ordinating the effort to combat the Communist menace," with the efforts of the Vatican, "vigorously engaged in the struggle against Communism," as the explanatory statement from the White House declared, after announcing the appointment. ²⁵ Mr. Kennan, the inspirer of gigantic American-Western rearmament and the leader of the "Free Russia Committee," had been designated American Ambassador to Moscow, where he went in 1952. Mr. J. F. Dulles, the American Ambassador-at-large and architect of the American-Japanese peace treaty (autumn, 1951), by which Japan had been converted into an American atom base to strike at Russia from the East, appealed to the world to speed up a powerful striking force "to deter the threat of Russian aggression by a decisive counterstroke." ²⁶

In Europe the Western German Chancellor, pious Catholic Dr. Adenauer, who daily recited the rosary to Our Lady of Fatima, went to Paris in the last week of November, 1951, and met another devotee of Our Lady of Fatima, Schuman, the French Foreign Minister and former Premier there, with the British Conservative Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, and the American Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. Germany was admitted into the anti-Russian European supra-national Army, because "Germany cannot be left outside the Atlantic family of nations," as Adenauer declared, and must be

admitted on "an equality basis, to fight to save Christian civilization."

Almost simultaneously with the *Osservatore's* official confirmation of the Virgin's message directed *personally* to the Pope—in the "gravest days of the Church's history"—the appointment of the leader of the "Free Russia Committee," and the Catholic German Chancellor's meeting with the three Western Foreign Ministers, a gloomy world Press—and that was not a miraculous coincidence—reported that the head of all the American and European armed forces, General Eisenhower, had arrived in the Holy City, preceded and followed by the Foreign, Economic, and War Ministers of twelve European nations, meeting for the first time in Rome to organize the anti-Russian military front. The General informed the War Ministers of the twelve nations that they had met to rearm the West as fast as possible, because of the imminence of a new dark age and of a new "barbaric invasion." Their task: the prompt organization of an American-led European Army of forty fully armed fighting divisions by 1952, and of one hundred by 1953.

At the same time General Omar Bradley, Chairman of the U.S.A. Joint Chiefs of Staff, was received in audience by the Holy Father, followed, shortly afterwards, by Field-Marshal Lord Montgomery, Deputy Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe.²⁷ Although not long afterwards the Vatican was deprived of its First American Ambassador-designate, wearing the stars of a general on the active list, General Mark Clark having subsequently asked to be relieved of his ambassadorial mission (January 14, 1952), sundry Army, Navy and saturation-bombing Air Force leaders from Spain, France, England, and, above all, from the U.S.A. continued to be received by that devout promoter and Prince of Peace, His Holiness the Pope.

While the Council of the War Ministers was sitting in the shadow of the Vatican walls members of the Australian Parliament were asked to give a pledge of secrecy before being addressed by a general. The general's secret message: "major hostilities" were going to break out soon.²⁸

In that same year the U.S.A. passed the American Mutual Security Act, which allocated \$100,000,000 for the creation of

an army of saboteurs, spies, agents, and terrorists, composed, not only of anti-Communists residing in the U.S.A. and Europe, but “to help any selected persons who are residing . . . in . . . the Soviet Union and her satellites . . . to form such persons into elements of the military forces.” This, as the Congressman who introduced the Act explained, in order “to render aid for underground liberation movements in Communist countries,” starting with Russia.²⁸

By 1952 uniforms, the regulation shoulder flashes of which, instead of being “U.S.A.,” were, ominously enough, “U.S.S.R.,” had already been issued to selected groups of Eastern European emigrés, who could speak fluent Russian—of whom, significantly enough, the greatest majority were Catholics.²⁸

Whether the growing power of Soviet Russia could justify the promotion of a third World War is anybody’s opinion. But facts, being facts, cannot be overlooked, and Vatican promotion of another world holocaust must be put on record.

For the words of His Holiness, favoured by direct personal messages from Our Lady of Fatima, were indeed bearing their malignant fruit. The Vatican, claiming to be a centre of peace, had become a vast, sinister centre of war. The ever-imposing processions of generals, admirals, war ministers clanking their boots along its marbled corridors was the most damning demonstration that these individuals—professional war leaders—went to see another war leader, the Pope, who by way of a most ominous contrast had hardly received a single peace delegation, either from the East or from the West.

The skilful amalgamation of Vatican diplomacy, of Catholic political forces, of the Church’s religious might, and of organized Catholic superstition had made of the Pope one of the supreme *condottieri* in the promotion of ideological and physical conflicts in the twentieth century. A further proof that unchartered religious superstition, astutely directed, can still be used to further the political goals of the Vatican and its allies by dragooning millions into a veritable global crusade, inspired by the blind emotionalism of a faith relentlessly conditioning its members throughout the world to war.

The identification of Fatima with the Vatican and its

calculated political exploitation of the religious fervour released by the new cult were made crystal-clear by the Papal delegate himself, when, after having told his one million listeners of the "eloquent messages" so unusually sent to Pius XII by heaven, concluded with the significant question-mark statement: "Is this not Fatima transported to the Vatican? Is this not the Vatican transformed to Fatima?"²⁹

The magnitude of the unexampled dishonesty of the Vatican in its efforts to promote at all costs mass superstition for political purposes can be judged by the fact that the final proofs brought forward by the Pope's paper as the undisputed seal to the authenticity of the Fatima miracle were *faked pictures*.

The photographs, purporting to show the sun on the horizon at noon—first published by the *Osservatore Romano* as of "rigorously authentic origin" and as providential, unique documentary evidence which "had succeeded in fixing the exceptional scene" (of the zigzagging sun)—had, in fact, been taken by an amateur photographer, one Mendoca, not in 1917 at noon, but in 1921 "during an atmospheric effect *at sunset*." These photos were given to the Cardinal Papal Legate at Fatima in 1951 by Dr. Joao de Mendoca, brother of the amateur photographer, a member of the reception committee at the Shrine of Fatima.²⁹

Cardinal Tedeschini could not resist the temptation to use them to kindle even further the credulity of the superstitious Catholic millions—as undisputed evidence that the sun truly fell to the horizon, zigzagging, at a midday in 1917, just as it had done exclusively for the Pope in 1950. The decision was taken by the Holy Father and the astronomically minded Cardinal, after they had both discussed the use that could be made of the photos (October 23, 1951).²⁹

Pope Pius XII ordered the editor of the *Osservatore Romano* to print the photos as the "authentic documentation" of the most astounding miracle of the century, which the Mother of God had now made *his miracle* by repeating her performance only to him.

The pictures were published, and within a few days had been reprinted by newspapers and magazines around the globe.

The decision was a matchless religious *coup* worthy of the best diplomatic *coup* of Pius XII, the diplomat. The

“authentic proof” of the Fatima miracle, by strengthening the credulity of millions of superstitious Catholics, automatically strengthened their belief in the special holiness of Pius XII. If the Mother of God had privileged him with such an astounding miracle, surely her purpose was to reiterate, and urge him to carry out, her mission. The message of Our Lady of Fatima, and the life-work of Pius XII, being identical—i.e. the destruction of Communism—it followed that it was the duty of all devout Catholics to follow the instructions of Pius XII, so miraculously charged by the Mother of God herself with waging war on Bolshevism.

The trick of the photos cannot be by-passed as another instance of Catholic chicanery, and ridiculed. Its real significance transcends the limited objective for which they were used. It demonstrated beyond doubt to what depths the cretinous credulity or the villainous exertions bordering on criminality of the master minds of the Vatican can sink in their attempts, by exploiting the religious emotionalism and superstition of hundreds of millions of Catholics, to implement their political designs.

The promotion of superstition on such a colossal scale must not be lightly dismissed. For religious belief, although intangible, by channelling the blindest instincts of great masses of human beings, can be translated into a mighty political force capable of playing no mean role in the ideological war which has split the globe.

This blind, ugly, invisible, and yet concrete power, wholly at the disposal of the Pope, by surrounding him with a supernatural aura and attributing to his office special direct divine commission, can not only magnify his religious status above all but simultaneously magnify his political power through the timely use of all the untapped, unreasoning religious emotionalism at his disposal, to further even more his spiritual and political influence upon the masses of the world.

Papal pride feeds upon its own uniqueness. The Pope's voice, as Pius XII declared, “is the voice of the centuries, the voice of eternity.”³⁰ It cannot be otherwise, for the most obvious reason that the Popes “hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty,” as Pope Leo XIII asserted in a solemn pontifical pronouncement, and that, consequently, all

Catholics, without exception, must be prepared for "complete submission and obedience of will to the Roman Pontiff, *as to God Himself.*"³¹

As the same Pope repeated in other official declarations, this is no mere rhetorical claim. The Popes regard it as a positive and undisputed reality. And, as a visible symbol of it, they wear the tiara, a unique representation made not of one but of three royal crowns,³² this to indicate that they are the supreme rulers of the spiritual, the ecclesiastical, and the temporal dominions: "Lords of the upper world, of the under world, and of this world."

No man, before or since, has ever lusted for so much. The mightiest rulers of antiquity, the most absolute monarchs of the Middle Ages, the most powerful dictators of modern times pale into insignificance when compared to them.

These astonishing claims are neither formalities nor colourful, high-sounding titles. They are still upheld with the same stubbornness as ever, not in the secretive hall of the Conclave or in the Papal chambers, but openly and in public, in this our twentieth century. The authority of the present Pope rests upon them. He is their visible, concrete, living symbol. During his coronation in Rome, while the triple tiara was being placed on his head, he was solemnly reminded of them with the following words:

Take thou the tiara adorned with the triple crown, and know that thou art the Father of princes and kings, and art the *Governor of the World.*

Are these now mere ceremonial words, the corollary of the splendid ceremonies performed at the coronation of a contemporary Pope? It would be the greatest mistake to think so. These are the very words pronounced at the coronation of all the Popes whose claims we have just examined; they are the very words which will be pronounced to the Popes by whom they will be followed; they are the essence of the spirit and of the doctrines of the Catholic Church, and, even more, the foundation stone of the Papacy and of the Vatican.

Catholic diplomacy acts upon them. Papal Nuncios accredited to the many governments of the world must officially be treated above all the diplomats of all nations, even

the mightiest. No world capital will be granted a Nuncio unless it recognizes him as the Doyen of its Diplomatic Corps.³³

The claims of the Popes of today must therefore be taken literally. For the Popes are not figureheads. They are the inspirers, the promoters, and executors of the policy of the Catholic Church. All her activities, all her exertions, all her political manœuvres depend solely on him. Decrees concerning the religious beliefs, the moral conduct, and thus the social attitude of hundreds of millions everywhere emanate from him. The immense Catholic diplomatic machinery moves wholly according to his directives. He can still make and depose rulers, free any human being from keeping any oath, order millions to support or to fight any political party, absolve any citizen from his allegiance to the State. He has no check of any kind placed upon him, no restrictions whatsoever. His will is law. His power is boundless. All Catholics must obey him "as God Himself." He is the most absolute ruler in existence. The most appalling tyrannies of the twentieth century are mild in comparison.

Is this exaggeration? Presently it will be proved an understatement.

The Pope, it must never be forgotten, besides being the supreme ruler of a Church, is equally the supreme ruler of a political ideology emanating from the credence that as the unique upholder of the truth the Church's mission is to see that her truth be made to prevail throughout our planet. This has made of Catholicism the most illiberal institution in the world. The man who rules it—that is to say, the Pope—being its executor, partakes to the full of such intolerance. Hence his absolutism, his religious dictatorship.

But, in virtue of the basic law of the interdependence of religious problems with moral, of moral with social, of social with economic, and of economic with ideological issues, a religious dictatorship ultimately is transformed into a political one.

Papal spiritual totalitarianism, consequently, spells Papal political absolutism, as, whenever his spiritual decrees are made to reverberate in political spheres, he intervenes in the non-religious problems of contemporary society. Hence his power favourably or adversely to affect the welfare of individuals and

nations, the policies of international bodies, and that most fundamental problem of all—the issue of peace or war.

What is the ultimate goal of a modern Pope? Precisely and everlastingly the goal of all his predecessors: the domination of the world.

To be sure, the demand for universal territorial domination, being too gross, has been modified to suit the changed times. Fundamentally, however, it stands as ever, unaltered, in its entirety. For it must be remembered that, *as political control spells territorial mastery, so those who are striving for universal political control are striving for universal territorial mastery—that is to say, for universal domination.*

The spiritual rulership of the Pope, therefore, ultimately signifies the political domination of the Catholic Church, obtained either via religious influence upon those who believe in her, via able diplomatic manœuvring with sundry State Departments, or via both simultaneously.

How is such double pressure exerted? And, above all, how can it affect social and political problems, and thus the life of Catholics, non-Catholics, and even non-Christians in practically all continents?

That is what we shall now try to examine. And the lesson to be learned should be learned in dead earnest. *As truly the conception of the world as a single Empire-Church not only has remained, but is the fundamental policy of the Papacy of today.*

5

CATHOLIC POWER AND MODERN SOCIETY

IMPONDERABLE AND UNDETECTABLE factors like the religious convictions of men are no less formidable than the might of armies and the industrial power of nations. They can still be the inspirers and, indeed, the promoters of political energy, unsuspected by the majority of the masses and often undetected even by administrations, governments or States, preoccupied, as they are, with the solution of pressing problems and the issue of peace or war.

Yet, as war and peace, with all their cognate questions, have become dependent on the two main contemporary philosophies advocating opposing conceptions of the purpose and function of society, it follows that if ideologies can move the world, religion, by inspiring some of them, can truly greatly influence global politics, even if by remote control, and thus ultimately affect the destiny of the human race.

Although the pressure of religious beliefs upon contemporary ideologies seems nil, to underestimate it because of its remoteness from political problems is a grave error. It certainly would be a fatal mistake with the one operating the immense, efficient and ruthless machinery of the Catholic Church.

The basic Catholic conception of how society should be run

differs widely from that of a large portion of the West, is unacceptable by almost three-quarters of mankind, and is vehemently rejected by the most revolutionary ideology of our times.

Catholic exertions, therefore, having to clash with non-Catholic ones, are bound adversely to affect the structures upon which the social and political institutions of the modern State have been erected.

It could not be otherwise, Catholicism's fundamental tenets making of it a dynamically aggressive religion, preying with undiminished vigour upon the rest of the human race. Hence Catholic interference with non-Catholics, directed at forcing them to abandon their credence and to conform their precepts to those of the Catholic Church.

Predatoriness sires resistance. And this, from the religious, assumes a social, political, and ideological character. Ideologies can make and destroy society. Society, however, is a complex organism—a combination of sundry races, nations, States, each made up of numberless human beings, with their own individuality, ideas, beliefs, and will.

To use an ideology in order to alter or to destroy, therefore, the first step is to see that its principles are accepted by the individual, the foundation stone of all social structures. Ideological principles are the begetters of political systems. These, being inseparable from economic problems, the economic from social, the social from moral ones, ultimately can be adversely or favourably affected by religious convictions held by the individual and hence by the Church controlling such convictions.

Thus, as religion can affect politics and as politics can affect society, it follows that the greater the number of individuals practising such religion, the heavier their pressure upon politics. In this fashion, the more powerful the Church, the more her influence upon civil matters will be, and therefore the more opportunity she will have to mould society according to her will.

Hence the Catholic Church's exertions to make a good Catholic of each individual, to have as many of such individuals, as many organizations formed by them, as many States made up of such organizations, and as large a society made up of such States, as possible.

The larger the society made up of Catholic States, the more powerful the pressure of the Church upon non-Catholic individuals, organizations, and society.

To achieve her goal, the Catholic Church does not exert her pressure only from the bottom upwards—that is to say, from the individual to the State. She also exerts simultaneous pressure from the top downwards—that is to say, from the State to the individual. Control of the State is the more efficacious, the Catholic Church using it to bring pressure upon all individuals within it. In this manner, by exerting her influence via the State, she can exert it also upon society, which she can thus modify according to her tenets. But whether exerting pressure upon the State via the individual, or upon the individual via the State, or upon society via both, her ultimate aim is always the same: the maintenance, strengthening, and furtherance of her dominion.

As only less than one-third of mankind is Christian, and only about half of these Catholic, and, furthermore, as only a limited number of Catholics are thoroughly devout, the Catholic Church is faced with a gigantic task. This is being made increasingly difficult by the ever-widening chasm between her tenets and those of a society often actively hostile to them.

Although not all her principles are antagonistic to modern society, yet many are, and it is these that compel her to interfere with issues which, in the eyes of the State, should be dealt with only by the State, thus provoking Church-State clashes.

Such clashes are not merely theoretical: they trespass into concrete reality and promote conflicts which sometimes remain purely academic but which, more often than not, develop into bitter struggles.

The Catholic Church boldly enters fields pertaining to the State, with the result that she is frequently bound to oppose, boycott, and even openly fight regulations or laws which she considers to be contrary to her own.

To have such laws repealed, modified, or harmonized with her own she will unhesitatingly wage battle. The instruments with which she will wage it will be her members, who, being duty-bound to obey her injunctions, will thus become automatically hostile to the State.

When her rulings are limited to religious matters—e.g. when

Catholics are forbidden to congregate with Protestants in religious ceremonies—then her interference, although objectionable, is strictly confined.

When, however, she steps further and intervenes, say, in moral issues, then the results can become grave. The Catholic Church is specific about it. "It is our own strict duty," said Pope Pius X, "to direct all men, without exception"—note, all men, including Protestants and non-Christians—"according to the rules and standards of morality in private and in public life."¹

A striking moral problem: marriage.

Marriage was instituted by society, declares the State. Consequently, it is the State's right to make and unmake marriages according to its laws.

Marriage was instituted by God, asserts the Catholic Church. Hence the State has no right either to bind or even less to dissolve marriage. For "marriage is holy of its own power, in its own nature, and of itself, and it ought not to be regulated and administered by the will of civil rulers."²

Consequently, marriage, according to the Catholic Church, is not a civil contract, but a totally religious institution. Indeed, more than an institution, it is "a sacrament," and, to regulate a sacrament is "by the will of Christ Himself so much a part of the power and duty of the Church that it is plainly absurd to maintain that even the smallest fraction of such power has been transferred to the CIVIL RULER."³

Faced by such an inflexible assertion some modern States, in their efforts to compromise, ruled that citizens could elect for either a religious or a civil ceremony—or, indeed, for both.

Citizens cannot choose, declares the Catholic Church. The State is wrong. Marriage is not "subject to human decrees or to any contrary pact, even of the spouses themselves," the nature of matrimony being "entirely independent of the free will of man."³

The pseudo-distinction made by modern lawyers to the effect that matrimony as a sacrament is the business of the Church, whereas matrimony as a contract is the business of the State should not deceive anybody, she further asserts. For "in Christian marriage the contract is inseparable from the sacra-

ment . . . marriage being the contract itself, whenever that contract is lawfully concluded."

Catholic citizens, therefore, are forbidden to choose civil marriage, the State having no authority whatsoever to legalize it, in so far as "the State cannot, and should not, devise a marriage system that is estranged from the Christian religion."⁴

Owing to this, Catholics cannot marry at a Registry Office alone, without committing a grave sin; and to marry before a non-Catholic minister brings them excommunication.

If the State cannot bind, then it cannot loosen either. This because "marriage is divinely instituted," declares the Catholic Church, and "therefore cannot be dissolved by any civil laws."⁵ In other words, the Church insists that the State has no power to grant divorce. Reason? Above every State "stands the unalterable Law of God . . . a Law can never be deprived of its force by the decrees of men, the ideas of a *people*, or the will of *any Legislator*."⁶

With this statement the Catholic Church affirms that her Laws are above those of the State, and that Catholics must obey, not the State, but her.

Acting upon such a principle, the Catholic Church has made her own laws on marriage, irrespective of whether these accord with those of the State or not, priding herself on her defiance of civil authority, as "in so doing the Church follows the example of Christ and St. Paul, who never asked the permission of either Cæsar or Tiberius to enact laws covering marriage . . . however much it might seem to be at variance with the laws of the State."⁶

Catholic citizens, therefore, by being forced to accept the tenet that marriage lasts for life and is indissoluble, cannot divorce. Hence no State can grant divorce. This condemnation, it must be remembered, does not refer only to religious matrimony, but, as Pius XI declared, "to every kind of marriage," whether of a natural, civil, or religious nature,⁶ everywhere, and this on the ground, it must be remembered, that Catholic moral teaching—and Catholic legislation inspired by it—is part of the natural law, and therefore is applicable to all men.

Catholic opposition to divorce and the prevalent moral decay of contemporary society in the eyes of many seems, at first, to

be justified. Protestant Churches, not so long ago, and several even now, agreed with the Catholic attitude.

Yet even its most rabid Protestant opponents sometimes admitted divorce. A Bill introduced in the eighteenth century (1721), during the Church of England discussion on marriage, besides throwing a curious light upon the moral code of that period, confirms this. The Bill forbade

any woman to impose upon, seduce or betray into matrimony any of His Majesty's subjects by means of scents, paints, cosmetics, washes, artificial teeth, false hair, Spanish wool, iron stays, high-heeled shoes, or bolstered hips

—any marriage to be so contrived was to be null and void.

This is a far cry from the modern wife who gained a divorce on the ground that her spouse obstinately refused to switch off the light in their bedroom whenever it was his turn to do so.

That loose divorce laws and the "divorce mills" have made of marriage a farce there is no doubt. That divorce is no longer granted as the ultimate solution to genuine marital problems its growing rate proves, and the reasons why it is generally granted amply testify. Its increase everywhere seems indeed disproportionate to the possible concrete reasons compelling married couples to part. In England and Wales, for instance, the divorce rate stood at an almost stationary 600 per year from 1900 to 1913, but then rose to 5,000 a year in 1937, and thereafter "multiplied by ten in ten years."⁷ In Sweden it has increased by 1,000 per cent in the past half-century. In the United States the average divorces per 100 marriages were 5.56 during 1881-90 and 25.89 in 1940-49, representing an increase of 466 per cent. The increase in divorce since pre-First World War years in England and Wales, 3,867 per cent; in Scotland, 691 per cent; in Belgium, 301 per cent; in Sweden, 481 per cent; in the Netherlands, 378 per cent; in New Zealand, 489 per cent; in Denmark, 391 per cent; in France, 225 per cent; in Switzerland, 108 per cent; in U.S.A., 221 per cent; while Japan, for which the figures were incomplete, the only "pagan" country involved, was the only land with less divorce, and there the decrease was only 7 per cent.

Immorality has kept pace with the loosening of marriage.

In two-thirds-Protestant Germany 89 per cent of men and 70 per cent of women had sexual relations before marriage.⁸ In a wholly nominal Protestant nation, the U.S.A., over 73 per cent of men have pre-marital intercourse by the time they are twenty.⁹ Before the First World War 12 per cent of American women were not virgins at marriage. By 1932-7 the figure had jumped to 68 per cent¹⁰ and by 1952 to 82 per cent. This without accounting for sexual crimes—for instance, rape takes place every forty-five minutes, all the year round, somewhere in the U.S.A.

This extraordinary moral breakdown is caused mainly by divorce laws, says the Catholic Church. For widespread divorce is morally harmful, not only to the two divorcees, but also to their children, causing a slow moral deterioration all around them.

This is true, but only partly so. Immorality is even more prevalent in Catholic countries. France, for instance, had nothing for which to envy America. In Paris alone, before the Second World War, there were 20,000 prostitutes. By 1952 they had jumped to 100,000. In super-Catholic Franco's Spain "prostitution has become entrenched as a permanent institution,"¹¹ in Madrid there being at least twenty-five well-known, government-approved brothels and a greater number in Barcelona. In Italy prostitution is controlled by the State, which makes good revenue out of it—certainly no recommendation for the super-Catholic Government of the Christian Democrats, who ruled that country for so many years. In the very seat of the Papacy there can be found literally hundreds of brothels, big and small, in the shadows of the hundreds of Roman churches. In Brazil, another country where divorce is taboo, over ninety per cent of the population has, or has had, venereal disease.

The exploitation of divorce by countries which approve of it, and the failure of Catholic divorceless countries to have a better moral standard than those in which divorce is permitted, although important factors, cannot be used as standards for or against it. The principle that divorce, as approved by modern society, is fair cannot be denied on the ground that it has turned into a social plague. If her opposition were based only upon this the Catholic Church would not, even then, be

justified in prohibiting divorce as she does. Her opposition, however, is based upon really objectionable ground—namely, that divorce must not be granted simply because she has so decreed.

Her stubborn refusal to accept divorce is based precisely on such an incredibly arrogant claim, upon which she has erected another, no less incredible—i.e. that for this same reason her decision must be accepted by all as the final judgment, regardless of whether or not individuals and society agree with her.

The gravity of her claims is further enhanced when it is remembered that she forbids divorce not only for Catholics, but also for Protestants, agnostics, non-Christians—in fact, for all. And wherever she has the power she never hesitates to enforce her prohibition—for instance, by compelling a State indiscriminately to prohibit divorce within its borders, whether its citizens are Catholics or not, thus curtailing the freedom of Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

In certain lands, non-Catholics who approve of divorce cannot divorce because of the veto of the Catholic Church. There Catholics must in blind obedience exert a genuine tyranny of numbers or influence over a minority—and, at times, even over a majority—to enforce their Church's ban. They are duty-bound to fight divorce, which, in many cases, they do with success. Which means that, wherever their will prevails there Catholic principles against divorce also prevail and are embodied in the laws of the State. Hence divorceless lands such as those of Colombia, the Argentine, and Italy under Fascism or under the Catholic Christian Democrats after the Second World War. Whenever attempts are made to introduce divorce the Catholic Church promotes a formidable religious-political opposition against anyone advocating it.

A striking illustration was that of Brazil, a country of whose population ninety-five per cent is Catholic, and with a Constitution making legal marriage an indissoluble contract. Repeated attempts to modify the Constitution, so as to introduce divorce, in 1946, 1947, 1949, 1951, and 1952, most of them in the Brazilian Congress, were invariably defeated by Catholic opposition, inspired and promoted by the Catholic Church.¹²

Such opposition is promoted with equal ferocity in Protestant

countries. Very often it amounts to nothing. Sometimes, however, it can have its own way. In Canada, for instance, divorce is legal on grounds of adultery, desertion, and so on—except in one single Canadian province, Quebec, where it is not. Canadian legislators, pressing to have divorce courts set up in Quebec, were invariably opposed by the Catholic Church, not only boldly branding divorce as “this plague” but also “condemning all legislation which would tend to weaken the indissolubility of the matrimonial contract,” as the bishops of Quebec Province put it (July, 1947), and repeatedly defeating the Protestant attempts to break the Catholic monopoly.

Catholicism is no less ferocious in non-Christian lands. In 1951 a Bill, called the Personal Status Bill, was put before the Egyptian House of Deputies with a view to legalizing divorce. Catholic opposition was immediately mobilized throughout the country. The Egyptian bishops sent irate telegrams to King Farouk, to the Premier, and to others protesting against the Bill, which proposed “to place marriage cases under civil instead of ecclesiastical jurisdiction,” saying that they could not submit to a law which would “so grievously offend their conscience.” Thereupon the Catholic Consultative Committee of Egypt announced that the Church would use every legitimate means “to prevent its passage,” to oppose individuals or parties supporting the Bill, and to mobilize all Catholics to ensure its final defeat.

Catholic opposition to divorce can thus be mobilized and, indeed, is perennially on the alert everywhere. Result: it is felt wherever there are Catholics—namely, throughout the world.

The Catholic Church does not confine herself to moral issues. She claims to be an authority on social problems—e.g. education, where, during the scholastic year 1952-3, she was running over 90,000 Catholic colleges, with more than 15,000,000 students, throughout the world.¹³

Potential citizens are first made in the schools. Hence the modern State's primary concern that these should impart education in conformity with its tenets.

That is the concern of the Catholic Church, the Popes whose

bitterest grievance is that they have been deprived of their former educational monopoly, boldly assert. The Church, being free from error, knows what kind of education is good and what kind is bad. Her duty is to teach the truth, whether the State likes it or not.

If the State conforms with her wishes, well and good. If not, parents "must keep their children away from schools in which they risk losing their Catholic faith"¹⁴—for instance, those run by the State. Should they avoid such an obligation, they court eternal damnation.

Canon Law 2391 is very explicit about it:

Catholics are subject to excommunication, incurred automatically and reserved to the local bishop, who, when they are married, make a specific or implied agreement to educate all or any of their children outside the Catholic Church.

To avoid hell, consequently, Catholics must "strain every nerve" to fight any attacks, from whatever quarter they may come, whenever they fear that teaching is not in complete harmony with that of the Catholic Church.¹⁵

In most nations education is in the hands of the State. Catholics, therefore, must oppose the State, which has no right to monopolize the education of its youth, for such a right belongs only to the Church. "A State monopoly of education . . . is unjust and unlawful."¹⁶

Catholics must fight the State even if the State is neutral on religious issues, for instance, in countries like the U.S.A., France, or Czechoslovakia, where there is a separation of Church and State. Here again the Pope is very explicit: "Any training of the young which neglects or repudiates the feeling and the spirit of the Christian religion is a crime of high treason."¹⁷

Neither can Catholics send their children to mixed schools. This according to Canon 1374:

Catholic children must *not* attend non-Catholic, neutral or mixed schools, that is, such as are also open to non-Catholics. It is for the bishop of the place alone to decide . . . with what precautions attendance at such schools may be tolerated, without danger of perversion to the pupils.

Catholic claims embrace all fields:

The Church's inalienable right . . . is to watch over the entire education of her children . . .

Pope Leo XIII decreed.

Hence schools cannot deal with subjects disapproved of by the Church—e.g. sex education. Should they do so, "Catholics must withdraw their children from any school whatsoever which gives sex instruction." Or, "arrangements must be made . . . to dismiss children of Catholic parents before sex instruction begins."¹⁸

Proposals to teach sex in schools created "horror and consternation" among Catholics in Britain,¹⁹ the cause of the "prevalence of sexual vice among school children" being attributed by Catholics to such instruction,¹⁹ and the fact that 50,000 babies were born illegitimately to girls of High School age in the U.S.A. within one single year (1947) being brought forward as a case in point.²⁰

Besides this, "children should . . . not be allowed . . . exclusive primacy of initiative" declares the Church,²¹ but should be taught to obey, first and last. Otherwise they might turn into rebels. The one million American juveniles annually arrested in the States should be a pointer that such Catholic principles are right. To avoid these and worse evils, Catholics should not only boycott State, neutral, or mixed schools, but run their own.

What is a Catholic school? A Catholic school, to quote the Pope, is a place where "all the teaching and the whole organization of the school, its teachers, syllabus, text-books of every kind, are regulated by the Catholic spirit, under the direction and supervision of the Church."²² A typical example: Spanish schools under Catholic Franco, in which youth was taught that Liberalism is a grave sin and that liberty of conscience, freedom of the Press, and sundry other democratic principles are "grave and pernicious errors."²³

Catholics must battle against anyone not conforming to the Catholic educational dicta. When so engaged they will be doing "a genuinely religious work . . . a religious enterprise demanded by conscience."²⁴

Following such injunctions, Catholics in Europe, the Americas, Asia, and Africa have been waging a continuous

war against their own governments on this issue. Generally speaking, their fight is carried out: (a) by direct political opposition; (b) by boycott of State education; and (c) by the setting up of independent Catholic schools.

In many countries where the State provides excellent, up-to-date, and free education Catholics have stubbornly refused to send their children to the State schools—e.g. in France, the U.S.A., Belgium, Holland. In England Catholics set up 1,900 educational establishments of their own, agitating, with a view to forcing the State—a Protestant State, it should be noted—to finance their schools, run exclusively by their Church,²⁵ threatening English Catholics with stern religious punishments for ignoring “authoritative advice” by sending their children to non-Catholic schools, brazenly banning attendance at State schools to the under-thirteens, and even asking all Catholic priests to act as a spiritual Gestapo by reporting any Catholic parents disregarding such advice.²⁶

In the U.S.A. Catholic versus State schools has become a major religious-social issue, with wide political implications affecting the very American Constitution. In Hungary, after the schools were nationalized, Catholics agitated and the hierarchy, by making direct appeals to parents, created social and political unrest of a most serious character, while Cardinal Mindszenty condemned the official text-books, calling “schools with no religious instruction” the “haunts of crime.”²⁷

Catholic intractability very often creates no mean educational or financial disruptions. The American Office of Education, for instance, estimated that nearly nine in ten American children attending the country’s non-State schools were in Catholic ones. Which meant that almost three million American children were boycotting the State-run educational establishments.²⁸

This cost American Catholics \$166,000,000, and English parents over £50,000,000, without counting similar sums disbursed by the American and British Governments.

To get their own way Catholics will use all forms of agitation or boycott. This can be promoted by the Pope himself—e.g. Pius XII, telling Catholics that tax money collected from all the people must be paid out for the support of Catholic schools.²⁹ Or it can take the form of an attack by

Catholic educators, like that launched upon a New York City teacher-training pamphlet, put out by the Board of Education, on the ground that it was "critical of the philosophy of their Church," and that "the philosophical theories endorsed in the bulletin by and large amount to atheism, since they hold that science and human experience are . . . in the [*sic*] final analysis the supreme judge of what is good or evil in society."³⁰ It can be screened by demands for special treatment, as in England, where, although Catholics form only five per cent of the active population, yet they asked that the Government provide their children with Catholic schools, financed by the Protestant taxpayers. Or it can assume the form of a brazen Catholic educational monopoly over the schools of a whole nation—e.g. in Italy under the Christian Democrats, where the Minister of Education was the former editor of the Papal organ *Osservatore Romano*, a fanatical member of Catholic Action, and Secretary-General of the Christian Democrat Party;³¹ the equivalent of such Catholic domination being as if Cardinal Spellman in the U.S.A. or Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary or the English Head of the Catholic hierarchy should, with Cabinet rank, be permitted absolute control of the whole American, Hungarian, or English educational structure.

Catholics will use all kinds of private and public pressure to force their will upon any reluctant government in Protestant, Catholic, and even non-Christian countries. In India, where Archbishop Mar Ivanios, after having issued a public protest against the educational plan of the Indian State of Travancore-Cochin, threatened the Government with civil disobedience and mobilized Indian Catholics against certain politicians favouring the plan, promoting serious sectional and political unrest, ending in the riots of Neendakara, where the Hindu Prime Minister of Travancore-Cochin had to intervene in person, after requesting Nehru, India's Prime Minister, to settle the disorders.³²

Or in England, where English Catholics during the general elections of 1950 were told by the hierarchy to "find out candidates' views on education" before voting for them. "Press our claims to the candidates at the forthcoming elections," they were told by Cardinal Griffin, Archbishop of Westminster. "We want them to tell us their views [on

Catholic schools] without evasion. When you have heard their answers, then use your vote." ³³

They will not hesitate to resort to the most unworthy tricks, like that sprung upon the French Chamber of Deputies. In 1951, after Catholic agitation for a State grant to Catholic schools had been repeatedly defeated, Catholic members made use of an unheard-of ruse. Biding their time, one day they unexpectedly put a motion granting financial help to Catholic schools. The motion was put forward during a Parliamentary night debate on the Budget, when only twenty members were present, and went through with a majority of two votes (June, 1951). The passing of the Bill aroused a storm throughout France, which had maintained a strict Church-State separation since the beginning of the century. The French hierarchy defended the legality of the Bill, mobilized in its defence, and, besides a furious campaign, openly resorted to political blackmail, threatening any politicians who did not support them with Catholic party and individual boycott in the forthcoming general election—e.g. Cardinal Lienart, Bishop of Lille. In various parts of France they went so far as to organize the Catholic electorate in a campaign of non-payment of taxes—e.g. in Western France. Such Catholic intransigence, plus the Catholic "trick vote" in the Chamber, finally caused the French Government to fall. The seriousness of the crisis can be gauged by the fact that for many weeks it became impossible to form a new Government owing to Catholic intractability. Four French ex-Premiers—one of them twice—tried, week after week, to form one without success, ³⁴ with the result that the nation, during a most critical domestic and international period, remained without a ruling body for well over a month—a record gap, even for France (July, 1951).

Similar crises occurred in Holland. And in Belgium, in 1948, the Government was brought down on the same issue.

The educational problem, consequently, being paramount in most countries, can be and very frequently is transformed into a most powerful lever at the disposal of a Church which has never hesitated to use it as a means to exert an ever-present, relentless pressure, to enhance, further, and promote her short- and long-range strategy of penetration into a field which she

is determined to rule as the sole, undisputed, and ultimate authority.

The claims of the Church to speak as an authority are not confined to morals or education, but embrace economic systems and cognate problems.

In our world this can assume tremendous importance. For ever a fundamental authoritative generalization upon economics can influence the economic thinking of millions.

Catholicism is a staunch defender of private property. Pius XII was explicit:

Economy is not by its nature a State institution [he said], it is on the contrary the living product of the free initiative. . . . It is the mission, in fact, of public law to serve private interests, and not to absorb them.³⁵

As the advocate of private property, consequently, it not only rejects Marxism as an economic system, but it has mobilized itself as the main defender of the by-product of the concept of private property—namely, of Capitalism—and hence of a society based upon its structures. Attempts within the rank and file of Catholics to find a compromise between the two on purely economic grounds, by the adoption of a joint management of workers and employers, finds no sympathy with the Church, although at times, for tactical reasons, she has permitted and even encouraged them. The Church's attitude on this is clear. Workers must not fall into the error of taking away the disposition of the means of production from the personal responsibility of a private proprietor in order to place it under an anonymous and collective responsibility. For "Trade Union demands for joint management of business," Pius XII warned, "are outside the range of possibilities."³⁶

Moral and economic problems ultimately turn into political ones. Hence, when Catholics oppose a divorce Bill or educational issues, make a government fall, or are directed to support private property instead of nationalization, then they are automatically being used as political instruments by their Church, acting as a political power.

The Catholic Church, however, does not act in such a

manner by indirect approach. She claims to be a political authority in her own right, boldly intervening in the political arena of many lands. This on the grounds that she "must not confine herself to purely religious matters," but, "as there is by force of circumstances reciprocal interpenetration of the sphere of political and religious action," she "has a close duty to keep a watch on political affairs," as Pius XII pointed out to the delegates of the World Congress of the Lay Apostolate, convened in Rome in 1951, from seventy-four countries.³⁷

Following this, it becomes imperative for all Catholics to intervene in politics, as "it would be blameworthy to leave the field open to people who are unworthy or incapable of directing affairs of State."³⁷

Catholics, however, must not only follow the general political principles of their Church. They must obey also the specific political directives of the Popes. For, as Pius X put it, "it is our strict duty to direct all men without exception . . . in the social order and in the political order; and thus to direct not only the governed, but rulers as well."³⁸

Such injunctions might have left the slumber of the faithful not in communion with Rome wholly undisturbed, although non-Catholic Christians had similar troubles, nightmares provoked by the political wrath of non-Catholic Churches being, in fact, by no means a rarity. Protestantism and Orthodoxy had ammunition of their own, some of which proved to be far more imaginative than its papal equivalent. For example, that of the Orthodox Church of Greece, which in 1916, after having cursed a Greek statesman, Venezelos, for having "betrayed the nation to the Anglo-French," forbade all Greeks to vote for him. The Orthodox injunction, in addition to its robust homeric ring, had colour and, above all, could be understood without any serious error of judgment even by the most subtle specimen of contemporary diplomacy:

Therefore, against the traitor [Venezelos] [the Church begins] we have invoked the following injuries: the ulcers of Job; the whale of Jonah; the leprosy of Naaman; the bite of Death; the shuddering of the dying; the thunderbolt of Hell; and the maledictions of God and man. We shall call for the same injuries upon *those who, at the forthcoming elections, shall vote for the traitor Venezelos*, and further pray for their hands to wither and for them to become deaf and blind. Amen.³⁹

Venezelos died of venerable old age, with excellent sight and hearing, although with fewer electoral victories to his credit than if the political equivalent of the "ulcers of Job" had not afflicted him, thanks to the Orthodox Church.

The injunctions of the Popes, although less spectacular, can bring results which, if not as picturesque as the Biblical "injuries," nonetheless are concrete enough to produce the most serious injuries to the political liberties of contemporary democracies. Unlike the Orthodox threatened "injuries," in our shaky political world, the Catholic Church has threatened nothing less than eternal hell to any Catholic absent-mindedly voting for the wrong politician, simply by accusing him of "mortal sin."

"Mortal sin" to millions of Catholics is as much a reality as are supersonic flight, television, and nuclear energy to millions of non-Catholics. Hence, when their Church threatens them with it a tremendous pressure is exerted upon their religious credence, which is thus automatically transformed into political pressure affecting the political balance of whole nations.

Under a Catholic dictatorship, no such extreme form of pressure is needed. A warning suffices:

The Church exercises her moral duty in recalling the grave responsibility attached to the vote.

wrote the Spanish Primate in a pastoral letter urging all Spaniards to vote for Franco's referendum for his succession laws of 1947.

In a democratic country, where citizens have their choice, however, the Church is very adamant about it. In Italy, for instance, on Sunday, May 20, 1951, the Catholic hierarchy posted orders in their churches telling Catholics that (a) every elector had a strict obligation to vote, (b) all electors must vote for those caring for the Catholic Church, and (c) that any elector voting for parties hostile to the Church would commit mortal sin, while any voting for the Communists would purchase for themselves eternal damnation. After which they—e.g. Cardinal Schuster of Milan—organized special services in every parish, for three whole days asking God to induce Italians to vote exclusively for the Catholic Party. Catholic

terrorization went further. It followed the Italian voter into the very polling booth. The Catholic Party, inspired by the Church prior to the elections, plastered Italian walls with one of their characteristic posters, with the following inscription:

In the secrecy of the polling booth, God can see you—Stalin can't!

The religious blackmail of such a slogan may have left the intellectuals and workers of the North immune: but it had a powerful effect upon the ignorant, superstitious masses of the South.

Similarly, in France, also in 1951, during the general elections, almost all French bishops issued pastoral letters calling on Frenchmen to vote only for candidates favouring the Catholic Church, warning them that to vote was their "inescapable duty," while its avoidance was "a most grievous sin."

In Belgium, in a Joint Pastoral Letter of the Belgian hierarchy, read in all churches on May 21, 1950, prior to the elections, the hierarchy urged "all Catholics" to vote only for candidates "whose programme takes account of the rights of the Catholic Church."

Political directives are given with equal boldness in Protestant countries.

In a Joint Letter of the Archbishops and Bishops of Scotland, for instance, which was read in all Catholic churches during Mass on February 12, 1950, just before the general election, the hierarchy stated that "No one may vote for parties or candidates opposed to the teaching of God and His Church."

In England Catholic bishops openly urged voters against certain candidates, and their injunctions were read in all Catholic churches.

We must make sure that our votes are given for candidates who can be relied upon to fight for our God-given rights. . . . I ask Catholics to remember that a vote cannot be cast for Communists and fellow-travellers, under the pain of mortal sin.⁴⁰

In the general election of 1951, they stated simply that "a vote for a Communist candidate is a vote against God."⁴¹

Similar injunctions, prior to local and general elections, were given in many other countries, whether Catholic,

Protestant, Moslem, Hindu, or Buddhist. For instance, in Egypt, Nigeria, South Africa, Java, Malaya, Indio-China, at times taking the form of prohibition of voters to support the political parties disapproved of by the Church by charging them with materialism or atheism, as they did during the general elections of 1952 in India, when the Catholic hierarchy called for special prayers to have those "who deny the spiritual aspect of life" defeated, such candidates being utterly unfit "to lead a country." "For this reason," the bishops declared, "you shall not give your votes to atheists and materialists," meaning the parties of the Left.

The bishops of the Philippines, during the elections in November, 1951, told Philippino voters that "to sell your vote is sinful, to use it to put evil men into power is gravely wrong, to refrain from voting will make you answerable before God."⁴²

The brazen exploitation of the religious convictions of Catholics for purely political purposes throughout the world, to make them vote for or against a given political party, is not the unethical, independent practice of certain Catholic hierarchies. It is the precise, calculated, political strategy conceived and promoted by the Pope himself.

In 1948 Pius XII, after having told electors that it was their inescapable duty to vote only for "those candidates who offer truly adequate guarantees for the protection of the rights of God," asserted in the most categorical manner that to vote for the enemies of the Church—or, indeed, to abstain from voting—*is a mortal sin . . . una culpa mortale*.⁴³

The Consistorial Congregation followed suit with a formal warning in the same sense, and immediately all cardinals in Italy, including those of the Vatican, came out with no less explicit statements of their own, promptly imitated by those in other countries, as we have already seen.

To strengthen this practice the following year the Church issued a solemn decree forbidding Catholics the world over to support, vote for, or belong to the Communist Party or to political Parties sympathizing with Communism, under pain of being *ipso facto* excommunicated.⁴⁴

To exert even more pressure the Pope went further, and not long afterwards he excommunicated all children belonging to Communist or Left-Wing youth organizations.⁴⁵

To believe that the Catholic Church has had recourse to exceptional measures to combat an exceptionally perilous enemy—namely, Communism—and that, consequently, her unscrupulous use of religious terror for political ends is justifiable, is to commit a most serious error.

The use of religious pressure to achieve political purposes is not exceptional. It has been the standard practice of the Catholic Church for over fifteen hundred years. The pages of the dark Middle Ages are brimful with examples. To her religious and political terror in those times the Church invariably added physical terrorization—e.g. interdict, when not even the dead were permitted to be buried, with the result, on many occasions, that these, having become a source of infection, eventually provoked plagues which exterminated entire populations.

Not so long ago she employed against Liberalism the same kind of religious pressure which she now uses against Communism—e.g. in the last century, when Catholics were repeatedly warned that to vote Liberal was to commit a mortal sin and would *ipso facto* bring excommunication. In Italy, for instance, Catholics were forbidden to vote in local or national elections or to stand either for local councils or for Parliament, from 1870 until 1914. This as a retaliation against the Liberal Government, which had sponsored the Separation of Church and State, advocated equality of religion and secular education, not to mention its refusal to hand back the Papal States to the Pope.

After the First World War the Church reversed such a policy, and compelled Italian Catholics to form a Catholic Party, in order to check the progress of the Left. When Fascism appeared and bludgeoned its way to power the Vatican changed once more and ordered the Catholics to disband, so as not to embarrass the new Fascist regime.

After the Second World War, with the tumbling of Nazism the Vatican commanded European Catholics to regroup, with the result that within a few years they came to control the political destiny of the Continent, as we shall presently see. When even this, after six or seven years, began to crack under the weight of its too obviously retrograde policy, the Vatican sponsored the resurgent neo-Fascist underground forces—e.g.

via Italian Catholic Action, which, on orders from the Vatican, grouped together under the description of National Front all the neo-Fascist movements, most of them supported by members of the Catholic Party, the Christian Democrats, who until then had attempted to come to the fore without success, owing to their lack of co-ordination.⁴⁶

Such mass dragooning of the Catholic vote and of Catholic forces, with its cumulative effect, can and does alter the scale of the domestic and international life of many nations—for this mass mobilization, it must be remembered, is world-wide. Similar instructions were given in Holland, Germany, practically all South American Republics, Canada, and, although with great discretion, U.S.A., Egypt, Nigeria, India, the Philippines, and many Asiatic countries.

The result is that, although Catholic political directives do not always yield what the Church expects, yet they contribute either to the strengthening or to the weakening of non-Catholic political parties, and not infrequently to their victory or defeat, sending into power men, political movements, and coalitions closely associated with the Catholic Church, or, indeed, blatantly acting as her political tools.

When that occurs, Catholic influence is made to impregnate the structure of a whole nation, whether the people like it or not.

Thus, whereas a government sent to power with the backing of the Church can, for instance, pledge in open Parliament its loyalty to the Catholic Church, as did the Malta Government in 1947, powerful coalitions, to ensure Catholic support, will openly pledge themselves to vote for the granting of financial aid for the Catholic schools, as did 309 members of Parliament in the French Assembly in June, 1951.

One Prime Minister can officially state that Catholicism "is our moral code and our guide in all our social relations," as did Italy's Premier, De Gasperi,⁴⁷ and another that "it is my hope to rebuild Germany on a foundation of Truth and Catholic Ideals," as Dr. Adenauer, Chancellor of Western Germany, declared in 1951.

All this will yield the far-reaching furtherance of Catholic tenets in the life of the countries led by either Catholic individuals or Catholic parties. In connexion with internal problems,

in Italy, for instance, under the rule of the Christian Democrats the teaching of Catholic tenets became compulsory, the Catholic religion was declared the only religion of the State, bills advocating divorce, birth control, sterilization, and so on, were scornfully turned down; the Lateran Treaty, signed by Mussolini and Pius XI, was maintained; measures affecting all classes were taken; the Catholic Church received special treatment or was even totally exempt from them. Such was the case when the Catholic government, after having been forced by the strikes of 2,000,000 unemployed, the seizure of land by hungry peasants, and the pressure of the Italian Communist Party to introduce land reform and begin a moderate form of land seizure, the land of the Catholic Church was left wholly untouched in spite of the fact that the Church was the biggest single landowner, with 1,160,000 acres.

In the international field the German Government, led by a Catholic, was made to embark upon a policy of ruinous rearmament, to save "Christian civilization" from "the storm brewing from the East," as stated by Chancellor Adenauer (October 5, 1951), and German foreign policy was carried out in the closest co-operation with Catholic authorities among the occupying powers—e.g. Ivone Kirkpatrick, the British High Commissioner for Germany, as staunch a Catholic as Dr. Adenauer, although not taking Holy Communion, or hearing daily Mass before beginning his work, as did the latter.

Owing to Catholics being in power, a whole nation can be urged, by the combined forces of the Catholic Church, to prepare for a future world war, to fight the enemies of the Church, and Catholic hierarchs can be given complete freedom to incite the people to such a war. Thus, Cardinal Frings, of Cologne, only a few years after the second world conflict, having repeatedly rebuked the Germans for their stubborn resistance to the fast rearmament policy conducted by Catholic Adenauer, did not hesitate to declare to a gathering of 25,000 Germans that "it is a false humanitarianism to fear war so much that you will permit any injustice to avoid taking up arms," going so far as to say that it was the duty of all Catholics to defend their rights with the power of weapons: "People have not only the right but even the duty to restore endangered rights . . . with the power of weapons."⁴⁸

Similarly in Austria the Church, besides supporting a policy of rearmament, came to the fore as the bitterest opponent of peace. Cardinal Innitzer, of Vienna, who, after the Anschluss in 1938, had urged all Austrians to welcome Hitler, issued repeated statements condemning peace demonstrations. "All Catholics are warned against signing peace petitions" was one of them.⁴⁹

In the Americas the effects of political Catholicism were no less striking.

In Canada the Prime Minister, Louis St. Laurent, became the main instrument for defeating a Bill advocating divorce in Quebec and the proposer for amending the Canadian Constitution to suit Catholic demands,⁵⁰ as well as forcing Protestants to observe Catholic holidays by issuing by-laws requiring them to close their shops.⁵¹

In Colombia the Catholic Church, after openly asking Catholics to vote for the Conservatives, solemnly backed the new Presidential Candidate, Laureano Gomez, a friend of General Franco, while the President, Dr. Mariano Ospian Perez, said curtly that he was determined to rule the country "according to the principles of Papal encyclicals" and nothing else.⁵²

In Uruguay the bishops planned to direct "all Catholic activities towards economic and social problems, as willed by the Church, throughout the country, now and in the future."⁵³

In Puerto Rico, the Caribbean dependency of the U.S.A., the bishops asked that the principles of social legislation, education, and so on be embodied in the Constitution in harmony with those taught by the Popes.⁵⁴

In Ecuador the Conservative Party championed social reforms based on Papal encyclicals.⁵⁵

In Brazil the New Constitution built on Catholic tenets made of Catholicism the State Church, and religion became compulsory in all schools.

The political directives of the Catholic hierarchies can, at times, even make official opponents of Catholicism court them with promises of support, as in the case of Mexico's Dr. Alfonso Cortinez, who, on accepting nomination as a candidate for the Presidency of Mexico in 1953-8, as a means to ensure

Catholic backing, openly promised complete support of the Catholic Church and the restoration of her former privileges.⁵⁶

The Catholic vote is a deciding factor in most elections throughout Protestant U.S.A., including the Presidential ones, as it is in Australia, where twenty per cent of voters, forming a Catholic bloc regimented in the service of the Church, can make their weight felt in no uncertain manner throughout that continent.

The ability of the Catholic Church to mobilize political forces should not therefore be underestimated. For truly she is a concrete political factor with great political implications which can profoundly affect society in non-religious fields.

It is the contention of the Catholic Church that she is not concerned with politics and does not mind what form of government the nations care to adopt. She has often declared that no Catholic is forced, has ever been forced, or is ever expected to follow her politically. That is not only inaccurate, it is false. For if we accept the fact that a moral question may be converted into a social and hence into a political one, it follows that Catholics ultimately have to accept the verdict of the Pope, if not in detail, at least fundamentally, on numerous political problems. In other words, it means that the Pope indirectly becomes the political leader of all good Catholics.

This cannot be otherwise. For spiritual obedience more often than not means obedience on social and political matters. By rejecting this or that principle a Catholic performs a social and political action. This not only if he is socially or politically minded, but even if he is wholly ignorant of social or political issues.

Thus it follows that, even when the majority of the Catholic masses are not directly active in politics or in social problems, yet, by following the lead of their Church in religious and moral matters, they become weighty political factors which, when strengthened, as is usually the case, by zealous minorities, can be made to perform actions of paramount political significance.

It may be contended that not all Catholics are good Catholics,

and hence that not all follow the directions of their Church. Which is true. Even so, the Church could dispose of one of the greatest political machines in the world. It has been estimated that, in a nominally Catholic country, one-fifth are active Catholics, one-fifth active anti-Catholics, and the rest indifferent but swayable to either side, according to circumstances.

In Protestant countries, e.g. the U.S.A., where Catholics are in a minority, the proportion of active Catholics is higher than in Catholic lands. Out of 400,000,000, the Pope would thus have at his disposal a formidable underground army of approximately 100,000,000 individuals.

When it is remembered how the anti-Communist underground movement in Spain during the Civil War, or the anti-Fascist ones during the Second World War, although small in proportion to the bulk of the population, played a leading, often a decisive, part in both military and political issues, and how such movements now have become as essential to political as to military warfare, it is not difficult to grasp the weight that the Catholic underground army can be made to exert in the internal and external affairs of many countries and, indeed, of the world, powerful units of these Catholic battalions being scattered over practically all continents.

If examined in this light, therefore, the contention that no Catholic is forced to follow Rome politically, although superficially correct, is seen to be not only misleading but untrue.

As to Catholic claims that, notwithstanding this, there can still be found many who pursue political lines independently of the Church, such claims are apparently justified, in that there do exist Catholic individuals, groups, movements, trade unions, or political parties which often give the impression of following a policy not only independent of, but, curiously enough, seemingly even contrary to, the broad political lines pursued by the Church. Such independence is not genuine. It is merely superficial: a clever make-believe designed to deceive the enemies of the Church, who, being a master of tactics, is in the habit of granting a seeming independence of action to local Catholic movements, as a tactical device directed

at enhancing their political influence, and thus the influence of their Church, which ultimately is what they are meant to further.

Such Catholic movements can be compared to army units on a battlefield. These may be given ample freedom with regard to the mode of fighting or of exploiting the ground. Their independence of the supreme commander, however, is local and very limited, they never ceasing for a moment to be under his orders. A local victory will bring ultimate victory a step nearer. Equally, while Catholics may be permitted independence of methods and a surprising amount of freedom with regard to their local religious or political habitat, they are never allowed to deviate from their final goal, and hence to ignore their supreme commander, the Pope. Whether their battle is fought in the most remote village of Mexico, in the U.S.A., in an African colony, or in Rome, their purpose is thus always the same: to further the influence and the might of the Catholic Church.

6

DUAL NATURE OF CATHOLICS

WE HAVE, THEN, A POLITICAL POWER reinforced by an inner religious belief whose vitality is inexhaustible and whose blind faith is boundless and above all reason.

Herein lies the secret of its strength: its continuity and perseverance, the most homogeneous institution in the world.

The Catholic Church is not, perhaps, endowed with all the qualifications of a modern political unit. For instance, her members do not live within well-marked geographical boundaries; she has no armed forces or industrial means of production with which to extend her influence; she is not run on the same administrative basis as are modern States; and it would appear that her members, scattered throughout the world and with their loyalty due to their respective countries, would be unable to organize themselves into a single supra-national political force.

If these were the characteristics of a modern State, such a State would suffer from a tremendous handicap. But in the case of the Catholic Church it is just in these characteristics that her strength lies.

The fact that she does not possess any well-defined area (Vatican State is 0.5 square mile) does not mean that she has none in which to exert her authority; the contrary is the truth—her territory is unlimited. It embraces all the lands wherein

exists a Catholic; and as Catholics live in practically all the countries of the earth, the boundaries of her jurisdiction are those of the planet.

While the external co-operation of States for trade, political, and defensive purposes is achieved by great effort and lasts not a moment longer than these States consider useful in their own interests, the Catholic Church unites into a solid religious and political bloc, surpassing geographical and political boundaries, all her members who are citizens of these same independent States.

A Catholic citizen of State *A* and a Catholic citizen of State *B*, independent of the fact that their States may be inimical, are equally governed by a universal religious and moral authority which is above both. The Catholic citizens of State *A* can favour a given policy concerning internal or external matters or social problems pursued by the hostile State *B*. Or, again, the Catholic citizens of States *A* and *B* can unite and support each other in order to resist a given policy—e.g. with regard to social problems—pursued by their respective States.

The leader to whom they can look for guidance, in the same way as the citizens of modern States look to their Prime Ministers, Presidents, or Dictators, is the Pope.

Thus, irrespective of the country of which they are members, intrinsically they partake of a *dual* nature and are citizens of two States: their country and their Church.

But their supra-national Church often follows policies in conflict with those of the country of which they are citizens. In such cases, if they are good Catholics, they have no choice. This for one basic reason: that, as their Church is the only repository of truth, and that, as only truth has all rights, so the laws emanating from truth—that is, from the Church—must prevail over those derived from other sources—that is to say, from civil authority or, in other words, the State.

The fundamental duty of Catholics being total obedience to truth, their fundamental duty concerning their allegiance is but one: total obedience to their Church. This makes them, *ipso facto*, members of the Catholic Church first and citizens of the State second.

Between the laws of the State and those of the Church those

of the Church come first and foremost, those of the State only second. If forced to choose, a Catholic is in conscience bound to forgo the laws of the State, for the reason that the laws of the State are wrong. And they are wrong simply because they do not harmonize with those of the Church. If they did, there would be no conflict, and the good Catholics would have no choice to make.

Consequently, if the laws of both Church and State harmonize, well and good. If not, the Church requires of Catholics their total allegiance to her dicta, to the detriment of that which they owe to the State. Hence the Church-State conflict.

This, perhaps more than anything else, is what has bedevilled and still continues to bedevil the relations of the Catholic Church and the State. The conflict is as ancient as the Church herself. It came to the fore, in all its fierceness, at the very beginning, when the Roman amphitheatres were made to echo with the moans of Christians, condemned, not for their religion as such—the religious tolerance of the Roman Empire having remained unmatched ever since—but because of their refusal to obey the laws of the State, in obedience to their religious convictions.

The chasm between the claims of the Catholic Church and those of the State has taxed the loyalty, not only of the citizens of the Roman Empire but, equally, of the subjects of medieval Europe—indeed, of great non-Christian lands like Japan and China. And this for the basic reason that the religious tenets of Catholicism are bound to promote an ultimate clash with the State, whether Christian or not. The outcome is that, wherever there are Catholics there the conflict will always surge in all its potency, with results surpassing merely religious or moral issues and theoretical or spiritual allegiances.

Medieval Europe was wrecked for more than half a millennium because of this issue, with political results that sometimes altered the whole of her history. At times the non-Christian lands were made to feel its nefariousness marring the relationship between East and West, with the most harmful consequences.

Peking in the seventeenth century had become a famous Catholic centre, where Jesuits were held in the highest esteem.

These, by 1664, had already published more than 150 books, in Chinese, on geography, astronomy, mathematics, natural science, physics, ethics, and philosophy, in addition to countless pamphlets dealing with the teachings of Catholicism, some of which were even printed in various Chinese dialects.

But while the Jesuits were respected in Peking opposition grew rapidly throughout China, provoked by a cogent question: whether or not Chinese converts should perform Confucian rites. Confucian rites were not formal ceremonies. They were integrated with the traditional social and political institutions of Chinese society. Consequently, by rejecting them, Chinese converts were rejecting, not so much a religious code as the established traditional secular tenets backed by the authority of the State. Chinese Catholics should perform them, asserted the Jesuits; this to prevent their being disloyal to their country. The Franciscans and Dominicans, however, declared against it. The converts were Catholics first and Chinese second was their contention, and their obedience to the Chinese authorities came after their obedience to the Church.

The controversy split both Europeans and Chinese into two bitterly hostile camps. At last it was decided to appeal directly to the Pope for a clear-cut decision.

Pope Clement XI (1700-21) denounced the Jesuits, categorically asserting that Chinese Catholics must sever all connexions with Confucianism, whether that implied withdrawal of their allegiance to the State or not.

The K'ang-hsi Emperor (1661-1721) naturally objected to such a decision, and questioned the rights of a "foreign prince" to issue decrees affecting the internal affairs of the Chinese Empire.

The Papal injunction created serious disturbances. Not because of the religious beliefs of the converts, it should be noted, but because of the crystal-clear implication that the authority of the Catholic Church came before that of the State and, hence, that Chinese Catholics, once members of such a Church, had to obey her laws first and those of the State second.

Pope Clement's successors upheld his decision, as did Pope Benedict XIV (1740-58) when, in 1742, another attempt was made to end the rites dilemma.

Similar issues arose in other lands, for instance, in

Korea, where Catholics were asked to destroy their ancestral tablets. Many did, resulting in their condemnation by the Korean magistrates, followed by political riots, which ended in persecutions.

The issue exists in all its entirety today and is as cogent now as when it took the form of the incense-burning of the Christians under the Romans, of the act of homage of the German emperors to the Popes, and of the Confucian rites of the Chinese. This is so because Catholics are still confronted with the equivalent of these situations now. Their Church is still telling them which laws to obey and which not to obey, testing the allegiance which they owe her with the same disregard for the rights of modern society and for the duties of Catholics as members of their State, as she did in Imperial Rome, in the Middle Ages, and in China. To be sure, the testing has been greatly modified to suit the changed times. Yet, fundamentally, it is the same.

This might be restricted to a conflict between a Catholic and his own Church. But it might not. In which case the conflict will trespass into social, educational, scientific, economic or political fields, and hence raise issues of great importance, affecting the authority of the State, and the relationship of the latter with its members claiming to owe their first allegiance to their Church,

A Catholic's allegiance can be taxed in many fashions, can vary a great deal, take on many shades, and reach many degrees. Certain injunctions of his Church can permit him an ambiguous, or even innocuous, choice. In others, however, neither doubts nor ambiguity will be allowed, in which case he will have to proclaim that the laws of the Church for him come before those of the State, and hence that he considers himself a Catholic first and a citizen second, his allegiance to the Church being paramount.

In some cases such dual loyalty can remain unaffected. On occasions, however, a Catholic can be faced with a painful dilemma, while at others it can be made to snap with dire results.

Some injunctions of the Catholic Church can be of the mildest nature and, therefore, in no way impair the authority of the State. At the same time, however, they can affect the

freedom of a member or of many members of one or more States and thus constitute a social issue of a domestic and international nature.

For instance, the Catholic Church prohibits her priests from membership of the Rotary Clubs and gives warning to Catholics, in general, against frequenting them. The Rotary movement is a world federation of businessmen; an influential body reflecting the combination of a broad ethical code with practical commercial considerations. By her ordinance the Catholic Church affected a basic tenet—namely, the freedom of association of a society of leading representatives of the professions, commerce, and industry whose total membership of a third of a million forms the 7,300 Rotary clubs scattered over eighty-three different countries.

The motive of the prohibition was revealing. It was issued on the grounds that Rotary was “one of those ‘secret’ condemned seditious or suspect societies which seek to draw them [Catholics] away from the legitimate supervision of the Church.”¹

To their protestations that “the Rotary’s programme of service is in accordance with all religions,” the Vatican’s reply was significant. Rotary had been banned just because it believed that all religions were good, which was tantamount to “tolerance of a Protestant type.”²

When, however, the Catholic Church prohibits Catholics from accepting certain scientific theories, thus interfering directly with contemporary theoretical and applied sciences, then her injunctions begin to assume a more serious character and, by becoming the concern of society in general, are also an issue affecting, to a minor or major degree, the authority of the State; e.g. with regard to education and to the acceptance of certain scientific changes or medical practices. This, claims the Catholic Church, is one of her rights, as it is her duty (in the words of the Vatican Council, April 24, 1870), to take “great care that the sciences do not admit error into their systems,” and that “they [the sciences] do not invade or overthrow the domain of faith.”

Which means that she claims to be the sole judge of what is error not only in the theological or ethical fields but, it should be noted, ultimately also in the scientific ones.

This was reiterated when Pius XII, dealing with the relationship of faith and science in his encyclical *Humani Generis* (August 21, 1950), decreed that all Catholics "must be prepared to submit to the judgment of the Church" on scientific matters.

What is the real significance of such an injunction? That Catholics and Catholic scientists are forbidden to accept theoretical or applied science which, according to the Church, is wrong.

Now this might remain a harmless Papal claim—as long as Popes set about correcting the calendar, as happened, for instance, before 1582, when the year was reckoned, according to the Julian Calendar, as containing 365 days and 6 hours, which exceeded by some minutes its actual length. The mistake was corrected by Pope Gregory XIII, who ordered that the day after October 4, 1582, should be called October 15, hence the Gregorian Calendar. The old style of reckoning was observed in England till 1752, when the day after September 2 was called September 14. Pope Gregory XIII, to make up the difference between the astronomical and the computed year, arranged that every fourth year should be a leap year—that is to say, a year of 366 days—but that in every 400 years three leap years should be omitted. 1700, 1800, and 1900 were not leap years; but 2000 will be a leap year. Changes such as these were called Papal interference with science and caused riots. If, the Popes' pronouncements met with objection in matters of this particular kind their authority might pass unchallenged even now.

The Popes, however, plunge boldly into far deeper scientific waters, claiming to be the only possessors of the truth in fundamental scientific matters: e.g. in the origin of the human species. Pope Pius XII was very explicit on the subject. In the same encyclical, after having decreed that all Catholics must believe in the real existence of angels, he affirmed that they must, above all, accept the story of Adam and Eve as absolutely true. The story is neither a myth nor an allegory, he asserted. It must be taken literally.

What, then, is the true implication of such a Papal injunction? The true implication is that Catholics must reject evolution. Pius XII, to make this quite clear, in the same

encyclical simply condemns any believer who acts as if the doctrine of evolution "were . . . proved by facts." To show that evolution cannot be true the Pope brings forward as the best undeniable evidence the advocacy of the theory by Communists. "Communists," he says, "gladly subscribe to this opinion, so that they may more efficaciously propagate their dialectical materialism."

Whether the theory of evolution is correct or erroneous is anyone's opinion. Science, not being infallible, has not yet dogmatized about it. Nonetheless, a tremendous volume of evidence points to its probable veracity. The Catholic Church, however, ignores it all, claiming that she has more sure knowledge on the matter than is supplied by all the scientific data put together, even when proofs are there to stultify her assertions.

Her claim to be an authority in the scientific field is based on the grounds that her dicta, when and if supported by faith, are the ultimate criteria of what is true and what is false.

Having thus disposed of modern experimental science, the Catholic Church takes another step forward, asserting with equal boldness that certain phenomena have occurred and are true, and must be blindly believed, in spite of there being neither scientific, historical, nor indeed even Biblical evidence to support them.

One of these is that "the immaculate Mother of God, Mary, ever Virgin, when the course of her life on earth was finished, was taken up *body and soul* into heaven,"³ thus pronouncing the levitation—in vulgar parlance, "air-lift"—of the Virgin an infallible fact. The Catholic Church contends, therefore, that this is *truer* than evolution, of which, by contrast, there are no proofs whatsoever. The Pope has spoken *ex cathedra* because of it 400,000,000 Catholics must implicitly believe it, under pain of excommunication. The Pope can decree that Adam and Eve were real persons, that evolution is a fable, that a human body went upwards, because "the Pope has divine assurance," as Pius XII said so humbly of himself and of his predecessors and successors.⁴

Consequently it becomes his right and his duty to tell Catholics not to believe in "myths" created by contemporary experimental science, such as, for instance, "the superstition of

technology” and the “productive organization,” as Pius XII declared.⁵ Catholics, therefore, while rejecting “the superstition of technology” on the grounds that the “Pope’s voice denounces errors, idolatries, and superstitions,”⁵ must accept the total truth that a material body like that of the Virgin Mary could defy the laws of gravitation, of matter, of time, and of space—without mentioning the problem of the abysses of the cosmos, which light, at a velocity of 299,813 km. a second, takes millions of years to traverse—and be “*taken up* body and soul into heaven,” as the most evident of all modern truths.

This is not binding on Catholics only. It is binding on all Christians, including Protestants and Orthodox. Not because, like Catholics, they are bound by the belief in the infallibility of the Pope, but simply because the rule of Vincent of Lerins that what has been believed “everywhere, always and by all” must be regarded as “God’s revelation to mankind.” Such highly scientific argument, it must be remembered, is one of the strong points of contemporary Catholic theology. So the ascension into heaven of a humble Palestinian working-class woman at some time in the thirtieth or fortieth year of our era is an incontestable historical event, because “there could scarcely be a more obvious mark of authority than the fact that four hundred million Catholics believe in it.”⁶

Whether this typical Catholic logic can be applied with equal certainty to another no less incontestable fact, which seems to have, perhaps, more historical documentation than the Assumption—namely, the universal belief, of not so long ago, that the earth was flat—is no longer a matter of open or public debate in Catholic quarters. The Catholic Church’s practical enforcement of her edicts upon scientific issues by means of the Holy Inquisition—for instance, against Galileo, who dared to prove not only that the earth, in addition to being spherical, revolved round the sun, but indeed that earth, planets, and all are in continuous movement, although superciliously dismissed as hackneyed anti-Catholic bigotry—is still too significant to be forgotten.

For the spirit which moved the Catholic Church to prevent Copernicus from publishing his astronomical discoveries and which condemned the philosopher Giordano Bruno to be burnt

alive in the square of an Italian city is not dead. It is as alive now as it was then.

The evolution of contemporary society has blunted Catholic intransigence to such a point as to make it practically harmless. The Catholic Church herself, thanks to a new policy of extreme caution, has greatly modified her attitude in such matters. Indeed, in a world made to pulsate ever more swiftly by the practical achievement of science, she has gone even further—by adopting her classical strategy. As soon as she has become convinced that what she tried to annihilate has turned into an invincible force, bitter opposition is suddenly changed into open courtship. The Pope, naturally, becomes her leading oracle, and the contradictions uttered would be unbelievable, even for the most mentally distressed, had not the reasoning faculties of many been previously paralysed by that masterpiece of Catholic evidence—Papal Infallibility.

Papal Infallibility does not apply to science, but it is near enough to faith and morals hopelessly to squeeze any logic out of Catholic minds.

A typical instance: Pius XII, after having decreed that all Catholics must believe literally in Adam and Eve and in the Garden of Eden, in the following year declared that he, the Pope, agreed with science about the Universe having begun some 5,000,000,000 years ago. These figures, Pius XII went on, clothed the opening words of Genesis "*in a concrete and almost mathematical expression*" (note the word "mathematical"). After having mentioned solid facts, such as meteorites, the oldest minerals, and nuclear physics, the Papal summing-up concluded that modern science at last had confirmed the existence of God and had "succeeded in bearing witness to that primordial *Fiat Lux* uttered at the moment when . . . there burst forth from nothing a sea of light and radiation."

The "Infallible" Pope did not see any contradiction between his first injunctions—namely, literal belief in the Biblical account of the creation and the acceptance of the notion that "the days" enumerated in Genesis should be understood as distinct epochs of prehistoric development, as advocated by modern science.⁷

In spite of Papal fumbling with modern science, however, the mulish Catholic broodings against it are unaltered. The fundamental Catholic tenet is still Revelation, as interpreted and expounded by the Pope, and only such Revelation is the ultimate truth. Science, lately, owing to its irresistible successes, has been promoted by Catholic opportunism to be one of the most "successful" appendages of Papal Revelation. Even so, scientific discoveries cannot be true unless approved by Papal Revelation. Whether Catholic beliefs are in open contradiction to logic, to the most elementary reasoning, and to the most concrete facts will not move the Pope or any Catholics, who will remain as unconcerned as sphinxes. It could not be otherwise, having swallowed even mightier incontrovertible "truths"—e.g. the revolving sun of Fatima; the mere assertion that a woman, 2,000 years old, is literally alive now, somewhere "in heaven," with her own *material body*, although slightly in disharmony with astrophysics, to them is as true as anything proved by science.

On what grounds? On the grounds that it is an "infallible Papal Revelation." Pius XII, in a most gracious effort to illuminate the opaque mentality of non-believers, took pains to explain that these could reach the same conclusion by the intelligent use of two supplementary truth-searching instruments: philosophy and science. But, warned the Holy Father, beware—for both philosophy and science can help one to find truth only in so far as they do not contradict "Revelation." If they do, they are no longer instruments of truth.⁷

Papal authoritative assertions could remain a matter of solace, even among the less intellectually ambitious, if they were confined to the Jesuit "ghost writers" concocting the Pope's speeches, decrees, and dogmas.⁸ But Papal utterances, even when not hallowed by the myth of infallibility, have the most serious repercussions. For they help stubbornly to maintain a most unsympathetic attitude towards the theoretical and experimental practices of science.

The result is that the distorted Catholic approach to science is seriously interfering with its free investigation wherever there are Catholics. This Catholic spirit pervades millions, so that Catholic interference with free experimentation, practice,

and application of scientific achievements—although almost undetected—is such as to be deemed impossible were it not true.

The Pope's denunciation of the "superstition of technology" is not an isolated denunciation. It is a significant tract of the fundamental attitude of the Catholic Church towards science. This is supported by concrete facts. The more a modern country is impregnated with Catholicism, the less it is scientifically minded. The most striking evidence lies in the fact that Portugal's or Spain's contributions to modern scientific knowledge in the theoretical and experimental fields are practically nil. This is not due to the inability of their people to keep pace with scientific or technical advances. The Iberian genius, if freed from the spiritual suffocation of Catholicism, could undoubtedly add its worthy share to any branch of modern science, on a par with any other race. Their sterility is primarily due to the super-charged Catholic atmosphere they breathe. This is allergic to science, and when the impact of science is so potent that it can move the Catholic Church herself, Catholicism still retards any scientific progress among Catholics.

Perhaps the most striking proof is that given by the American Catholics. American Catholics are part of the most scientifically- and technologically-minded nation of the West. The opportunity for them, if not to excel, at least to compare favourably with non-Catholic scientific, theoretical, or experimental workers could not be more aggressively favourable. Yet what is their achievement? Catholic colleges and universities are at the bottom of the list for published research, just as Catholic medical schools are at the bottom of medical rating lists; and of 303 "starred" scientists listed in *American Men of Science* only three, or less than one per cent, are Catholics. Though claiming the largest membership among all religious bodies in the U.S.A., they provide by far the smallest number of scientific research workers in proportion to their number.⁹

As for the prominent "Catholic" scientists produced in Italy, France, and Germany and claimed by the Church as her members, the overwhelming majority were only nominally Catholic. Most of them, in addition to having discarded Catholic allegiance, lived as agnostics or even as atheists, the proportion of Catholic scientists who remained practising Catholics

being less than one per cent. Such Catholic backwardness, more than significant, is ominous.

But where the deadening weight of Catholicism is made to be felt, perhaps, more concretely than in any other particular branch of science, is in the medical field. Here the Catholic Church's claim to being the ultimate authority is still being pushed to its utmost limit with an unheard-of boldness and with the gravest results for the individual, the State, medicine, and science.

To be sure, the Catholic Church does not bind medicine in general, as she did when the secular sword was at her disposal—for instance, during the Dark and Middle Ages. In those days she arrested medical progress for at least five hundred years by strictly forbidding medieval surgeons to study the human body, by making autopsies, on the ground that it was a mortal sin against the Holy Ghost, whose temple the body was, and by burning a few surgeons by way of example.

But if she can no longer brandish a secular sword, she can still brandish a spiritual one, which, for several hundreds of millions of people is, at times, still more powerful than the sword of old.

This permits her to enter as an authority into fields from which she should be excluded, provoking an impact upon a paramount branch of science, the medical one, which sometimes results in the gravest consequences: e.g. stultification of the authority of the State by taxing its members' loyalty, claiming, with unheard-of arrogance, that any Catholic, no matter in what State he might live and regardless of his or her social status, must obey the laws of the Catholic Church first and wholly disregard those of the State whenever these do not conform with hers.

Her injunctions in this particular field can range from some bordering the dark chambers of superstition—e.g. Catholic frowning upon certain currents of modern psychology—to surgical operations, in which the Church's command becomes literally a matter of life and death.

The Catholic Church has always frowned upon psychology and psychiatry. She has never dared openly to condemn them,

but has put up a passive resistance tacitly amounting to a silent, bitter opposition. Psychology, by entering into a forbidden inner emotional and spiritual temple of man, is, according to the Catholic Church, violating a place where only the Church is supreme. Hence it should be discouraged. Psychology threatens to minimize, indeed even to do away altogether with, sin. How could the Church survive without the existence of sin?

I am a spokesman of the Catholic Church when I say that any positive denial of sin on the part of Freudian psycho-analysis renders that science inadequate for handling problems which affect the whole man,

declared Mgr. Fulton Sheen, of the Catholic University of America, following the resignation of some Catholic psychiatrists, after the latter's attack on psycho-analysis in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York.¹⁰

"Cows have no psychoses, and pigs had no neuroses, and chickens are not frustrated. . . . Neither would man be frustrated . . . if he were an animal made only for this world," was the worthy prelate's a-Freudian logic.¹¹

Psychiatrists, therefore, must not supplant priests. Mass exorcism should be preferred to psychological treatment.

From this to surgical operations dealing with mental disorders is a small step, and Catholic resistance gets stronger. Operations on the brain, or prefrontal leucotomy, a surgical treatment for mental and psychological disorders, are stubbornly discouraged. Reason? Such operations may impair the patient's free will, may produce a marked change in his personality, and, last but not least, may produce "a tendency to be less religious."

Operations of this kind, as a Catholic specialist had to admit, "are a bogey in Catholic eyes,"¹² and greatly discourage both Catholic specialists and Catholic patients from dealing objectively with medical progress in this specialized field.

In certain matters, however, the Catholic Church openly tells her members to disobey the State. For instance, when dealing with euthanasia. A movement has grown in all civilized countries to dispose of in the most humane fashion, either voluntarily or otherwise, and after due precautions have been taken that no injustice is committed, individuals who

might be judged a burden to themselves and to society.

Some States have tacitly adopted euthanasia. Others will undoubtedly legalize it. Catholics living in such States, however, will disobey their countries' laws to obey those of their Church.

The Church is very explicit on the matter and has warned them repeatedly concerning their duty to disobey such measures, formally declaring that the killing of "those who . . . are not only useless . . . but also a burden upon it [society] is contrary to positive natural and divine right, and, therefore, unlawful."¹³

Hence all Catholics must oppose euthanasia, whether it is legalized or not, even if it is carried out "by order of public authority."¹⁴

Catholics, however, can influence in their favour local, national, and even international bodies, thus making the Catholic Church's edicts applicable to non-Catholics as well. As, for instance, when the Council of the World Medical Association, representing more than 500,000 doctors from forty nations, meeting in Copenhagen in 1950, condemned euthanasia "in any circumstances"—a decision publicly applauded by Cardinal Spellman of New York, as conforming to the tenets of the Catholic Church, who had primarily inspired the Association with its decision.

Euthanasia and cognate issues are still controversial subjects, and hence, having been not yet universally adopted by society, Catholics, by obeying the command of their Church, cannot be accused of disobeying the laws of the governments of which they are citizens.

But where the dicta of the Catholic Church have, perhaps, more far-reaching results, affecting as they do the individual, the State, society, and indeed the world at large, is in the field of what Catholics disparagingly call the "pseudo-science" of eugenics.¹⁵ Here the Catholic Church does not confine herself to frowning upon or to advising, but actually dictates to her members what and what not to do, unequivocally and without appeal, wholly regardless of their duty as citizens of the State, members of society, and inhabitants of the earth.

Catholics have no say whatsoever. The supreme authority is neither themselves, the medical profession, nor the State. It

is the Catholic Church, whose laws are above those of the State, which all Catholics must repudiate when they have to make a choice between them and those of the Church. The sexes exist only to propagate the human race, declares the Church. Hence married couples must in no way prevent the birth of children. Anything done contrary to that is sinful and hence is strictly forbidden.

This sounds a harmless enough theoretical declaration. But its effects are boundless. They reverberate in the moral, social, economic, and political spheres. They become a potent brake in the field of applied medicine, and thus a social obstacle of paramount importance.

For this means that 400,000,000 Catholics cannot adopt birth control, a practice rendered necessary by economic and social circumstances, both for the individual and for the State. Birth control is only one. Sterilization, advocated by individuals, the medical profession, and the State, is also strictly forbidden. Artificial insemination, which is on the increase and which is also in many cases recommended by both the medical profession and the State, cannot be practised by Catholic couples: "It is absolutely ruled out."¹⁶

Certain States have legalized artificial insemination and, with it, the children born by this new medical achievement. The Catholic Church orders her members completely to ignore the laws of the State—indeed, to disregard them—to treat citizens who have resorted to it as adulterers and their children as illegitimate, for "a child conceived in these circumstances would be illegitimate."¹⁶

The prohibition of birth control affects not only Catholics but also non-Catholics. Four hundred million people, scattered in all countries, when disregarding it in obedience to their Church, create a social and economic problem of great consequence, particularly when the tendency to regulate the increase of the State's and the world's population has become a necessity.

Certain countries are overcrowded. Both in the East and in the West populations are increasing at an alarming rate, taxing the economic balance of great geographical and economic units. This tendency has become universal, and hence its effects are not only local but world-wide. Thus, each day the

newly born exceed the number of deaths by 60,000, whereas, if only births as such are taken into account, every three seconds two human beings are being born every day and night of the year. And, thanks to medical science, the two are rapidly moving to three. India's population, for instance, has increased by fifteen per cent in each of the last two decades—over 4,000,000 every year—an increase of 42,000,000 between 1942 and 1952.

At the same time the cultivable area of the world is shrinking, because of soil erosion and for other reasons, while the distribution of food is grossly mishandled owing to the archaic economic systems and the anarchical economic interchanges of many food-producing and food-consuming nations. Undoubtedly when the world economic system is rationally planned, the land is scientifically tilled, and atomic energy utilized, the fear of an increasing world population will prove unfounded. On the other hand, the fear of nations being unable to feed their peoples because they are over-populated at present is real. Millions are under-nourished, starving, and dying.

Hence the necessity to regulate the growth of population. Birth control is the paramount remedy. The United Nations, as well as political, economic, and medical authorities, have all seconded it. In India and Pakistan the Governments have promoted a network of birth-control clinics, because of the two countries' "extremely high fertility." In China family planning is spreading among the lower classes. In Japan, where excess of births over deaths is approximately 1,600,000 yearly, the Diet enacted the Eugenic Protection Law, containing clauses by which to establish offices throughout Japan in order to popularize birth control. Japan is a non-Christian country. It has less than 200,000 Catholics in a population approximating 90,000,000. Yet the Catholic Church, incredible as it may seem, successfully attempted to thwart the will of the Japanese people by sanctioning Catholic doctrines upon a non-Christian nation.

This was done, Catholic fashion, by blackmailing the American authorities in occupation. In 1949 the population of Japan had risen to 82,000,000—an increase of some 9,500,000 since 1945. The Government decided on a policy of birth-

control teaching and urged the Americans to co-operate. The Americans did. But immediately a cry of protest rose against their permission. From the Japanese people? Not at all! From the tiny Catholic minority, from an even smaller group, the American Catholic Women in Japan, from Catholics in the U.S.A., and from the Vatican.

General MacArthur, the American Commander, was promptly subjected to Catholic pressure groups, particularly in Washington. The American Catholic Women's Club of Tokyo and Yokohama,¹⁷ Cardinal Spellman, Catholic Congressmen and Senators contacted the General. Birth control must be forbidden in Japan.

General MacArthur agreed. References to birth control in publications released by his headquarters were deleted, and on June 6, 1949, he disavowed the Occupation Advisers' birth-control statement. In January, 1950, still under relentless Catholic American pressure, he quashed a new attempt by a division of the Japanese Administration, the Natural Resources Section, to propagandize birth control.

When MacArthur was dismissed (spring, 1951), and after Japan signed a peace treaty with the U.S.A. (autumn, 1951), the Japanese Government promoted a new campaign, in view of the fact that "the Japanese peace treaty did not allow any outlet for the nation's excess population"; the *Osservatore Romano*, with an effrontery matched only by that authority for which it spoke, condemned the Japanese Government and the practice, teaching, and promotion of birth control in non-Christian Japan.¹⁸

But where Catholic injunctions are sanctioned, via direct orders from the Vatican, is in the West. There the rate of increase in population is about five per cent in ten years. Yet certain European countries are so overcrowded that they are unable to feed their populations—e.g. Catholic Belgium and Italy.

A most striking instance occurred in Protestant England. In 1951 the British Government charged a Royal Commission with making proposals for the regulation of the country's population. After a long and patient investigation the Commission proposed, as a long-range policy, a moderate form of birth control—namely, that the population in England be

increased by about six per cent and, thereafter, be maintained at that level. Among other measures the Commission recommended that all married couples should be offered instruction in artificial contraception.

The hierarchy of England promptly issued an official statement condemning them outright. "We must proclaim again that artificial contraception is intrinsically evil, contrary to the law of God, and a mutilation of the purpose and process of the sexual act."¹⁹

The State implemented the recommendation of the Commission as part of a national policy, through the National Health scheme, and the Catholic Church again promptly condemned the State's instrument, declaring: "It is an abuse of a position of authority and not to be tolerated."²⁰ "Since the teaching of artificial contraception through the medium of the National Health Service is an integral feature of the plan proposed, we must condemn the plan on that ground alone."¹⁹ "Any Catholic woman who goes to an Institution for medical or surgical treatment . . . must decline to sign [any document] . . . unless she consult a priest" ordered the Archbishop of Glasgow.¹⁹ The Church went further and ordered all Catholic doctors to refuse to implement the instructions of the National Health scheme: "Catholic doctors . . . are obliged in conscience to refuse to give the instructions in artificial contraception which the Commission proposes for inclusion among the duties of medical practitioners under the National Health Service."¹⁹

The gravity of this can be judged when it is remembered that doctors in England are employees of the State under the National Health Service.

The Catholic Church then ordered not only the medical profession but also all English Catholics to disobey the instructions of the State: "For married couples to limit their families, even by innocent means, in deference to a State-made scheme . . . would be not only sinful . . .," and thus "there is no course open to us but to condemn the scheme, outright, and to direct the Catholics of this country that it is their duty to do all in their power . . . to prevent the implementation of these proposals."¹⁹

English Catholics had to consider themselves Catholics first

and Englishmen second, thus putting the laws of their Church above those of their government, and hence openly declaring themselves members of the Catholic Church first and of the State second.

As the Catholic Church did not hesitate to declare her laws to be above the laws of a Protestant country, so she has never hesitated to proclaim such laws above those of non-Christian lands, such as Islamic Egypt; India, partly Islamic and partly Hindu; and Japan, partly Buddhist and partly Shintoist. Her laws, she claims, are above those of all governments the world over, and hence her members, no matter under which government they may find themselves, be it that of the United States of America or of Communist China, must obey her first and their government second.

Obedience to the Pope's laws, however, at times becomes a matter of life and death. Once more Catholics have no say whatsoever. This is so when it is a matter of choice between saving the life of a baby or that of the mother. The Catholic Church has firmly maintained that the mother must be sacrificed.

Owing to the tendency of many doctors and Catholic parents to overlook this basic ruling, the Popes, from time to time, come out with ever more outspoken rules about it. One of the very clearest was that of Pius XII in 1951, considered to be of exceptional importance for having brought up to date earlier pontifical utterances on this question.

In it the Pope, after having decreed that all Catholics, nurses, midwives, doctors, or any members of the medical or cognate professions must always categorically *refuse* to prevent procreation, stated that when it comes to the question of a choice between saving the life of the mother and that of the unborn child a husband, a doctor, or even the State have to obey only the law of the Catholic Church—namely, sacrifice of the mother—for

every human being, even a baby in its mother's womb, has the right to live. . . . That right comes from God, not from the parents nor from any human society or authority.

The Pope asserts, therefore, that the right to decide rests not with the husband or with the doctor or with anybody else, but with the Catholic Church :

There is no man, no human authority, no science, no medical, eugenic, social, economic, or moral reason, which may give a valid decision . . . for choosing to save the life of the mother instead of that of the unborn child. The sacrifice of the baby "is forbidden . . . and cannot be justified in any way."²¹

The Pope's unequivocal ruling created a world-wide reaction, although the Papal pronouncement in reality was nothing more than a frank reiteration of one of the Catholic laws.

Of the Pope's ruling that the baby has the right of survival over the mother, "such a view will be frankly horrifying to millions of non-Catholic husbands," commented an important English organ. "It cuts right across the natural human instincts and is a complete reversal of the traditional attitude."²²

An organ of the Church of England accused the Pope of "overstepping the limit of common sense," calling his injunction "inhuman, callous, and cruel."²³

The Pope's reassertion was a sharp reminder to Catholics that they are members of the Church first and of their country second. The reminder was directed also to non-Catholics and, indeed, to the modern State, and became, therefore, a matter of public interest and not "an unwarranted intrusion into the private concerns of others."²² "In Protestant countries, a matter of grave public policy is involved, for the Papal pronouncement will affect Protestant parents in almost equal degree."²²

The seriousness of the issue can be gauged by the fact that the Pope's rules, besides being strictly observed in Catholic lands and institutions, are also complied with in the countless maternity homes, hospitals, and clinics in Protestant and non-Christian countries where there are Catholic nurses, midwives, doctors, and gynecologists who are in duty bound to obey the Pope's will instead of that of the husband, the medical authorities, or the State of which they are citizens.

Consequently Catholic laws are being enforced even upon non-Catholics by Catholics living in Protestant and non-Christian countries. In clinics and maternity homes in England, the U.S.A., Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the African colonies, Asiatic countries including Japan, and wherever

Catholics are employed by non-Catholic authorities, the religious belief of Catholics does not and cannot remain a matter of purely personal concern. For Catholics will automatically condemn to death either the wife, mother, or sister of a Protestant in the U.S.A., of an Orthodox in Rumania, of a pagan in Central Africa, or of a Shintoist in Japan in obedience to the Pope's ruling. The same applies to any other citizen who may not even hold any religious belief at all.

That the denomination of doctors, midwives, and obstetricians which, in the case of Protestants and non-Christian, or agnostic individuals, institutions, or States, can safely be considered only a matter of personal concern, cannot be said of Catholics. For Catholics, having to obey laws made in Rome and therefore disobey those made in their own respective countries, act according to such laws. Thus, in the medical field, a Protestant or agnostic husband may find out too late that a life-and-death decision concerning the life-partner has been in the hands of one committed to a principle abhorrent to him.

The implication of the Church's ruling on this vital issue did not escape non-Catholics anywhere. The seriousness of the Pope's command became even graver in those countries with socialised medicine—e.g. England, with her National Health Service. For there Protestants, particularly of the working classes, having little or no choice of what hospitals or clinics they attend, have even less opportunity to avoid entrusting their wives to Catholic doctors. Many non-Catholics were registered patients of Catholic physicians. This meant that non-Catholic patients were at the mercy of Catholics who applied the Papal decrees, whether they liked it or not.

Fears and concern about this brought assurances from leading Catholics, but such assurances, besides being unconvincing, had the reverse effect. They proved anything but that Catholic doctors "would put an issue like that fairly and squarely to the patient," as promised by Father A. Bonnar, or that "they would be told quite clearly that the doctor was not prepared to carry out the wishes of the patient or relatives, but that there were plenty of other members of the medical profession available if necessary."²⁴

On the contrary, many objected that Catholic morality on

this subject seemed to mean no morality at all, which was correct. For these kinds of assurances were mere subterfuges. Catholic doctors were adamant in upholding just the opposite view. The sending of patients to non-Catholic doctors to perform, for instance, a therapeutic abortion,

gives scandal to a serious degree both to the patient and to the physician to whom he refers the patient, since he gives other human beings the opportunity to do the wrong which he knows he cannot in conscience do himself. This is true, regardless of whether either is a Catholic, since the natural divine moral law is binding upon all.²⁵

It was in consequence of this that numerous English town councils asked the Government that "from now on it will be essential, in justice to all parents who are not Catholics, that their religious persuasion [of the medical staff] should be known." This particularly on account of the grave "alarm at the possibility of staffs following the Pope's edicts."²⁶

Questions were asked in the House of Commons and in the Chambers of Deputies in France, Belgium, and Holland. In the U.S.A., local and Federal authorities were interrogated in connexion with taking safety measures about Catholic laws not being enforced upon Protestants by Catholic staffs. Even in Japan the Government was asked to take similar steps to safeguard the rights of Japanese husbands whose wives were attending Catholic hospitals.

The issue of Catholics owing their allegiance not to their government but to the Pope is thus not confined to the theoretical or religious fields. It can become, and very often is, a problem of the most cogent and immediate concern for both the individual and society as a whole. A wise State, therefore, in addition to bestowing particular attention on all Catholics in its midst, should keep a constant watch upon the behaviour of citizens who, by considering themselves bound to obey the laws of their Church, believe themselves entitled to disregard those enacted by the people.

7

SUBJECTS OF THE CHURCH, FIRST— CITIZENS OF THE STATE, SECOND

CATHOLICS, HAVING TO OBEY LAWS enacted in Rome, must act according to such laws. Their enforcement is restricted neither to religion nor to moral problems. It trespasses across social boundaries. By raising grave social issues, it clashes with the individual faced with a double loyalty, with the society charged with dealing with such laws, and with the State whose authority they challenge.

The contention that, by binding only Catholic consciences, they do not infringe upon those of the State, is erroneous, dishonest, and untrue. They bind not only individual Catholics as individuals, not only Catholics as professional men—e.g. doctors forced to respect the precise laws laid down for them by the Church—but also Catholics as legislators, and hence as leaders of a party, of a government, and of a State.

This means that Catholic laws must be obeyed by politicians who are Catholics, be they town-councillors or premiers, and that, because they are Catholics, they must disregard the laws of the State to obey those of their Church.

When this occurs the clash between the laws of the Church and those of the State is neither restricted to the theoretical field nor does it remain the concern of the conscience of

individual Catholics. It becomes a public concern: the concern of the State, and hence the concern of the people. For it is against the authority of the people that the laws of the Church are enacted and enforced.

The moral laws of the Church, by binding the conscience of Catholic doctors, are enforced in the medical profession by Catholics who are also doctors. They, when employed by the State, are hired as doctors who agree to the contract, with all its obligations, offered to them by the State. The Catholic Church, however, can intervene, and, by so doing, force the doctor to violate the agreement and be untrue to his contract. All this in virtue of the fact that the doctor, as a Catholic, is conscience-bound to bow before the authority of his Church in preference to that of the State.

Precisely the same obligation is incumbent upon individuals engaged in public administration or in the government of a nation. Laws which the individual, as a politician concerned with the welfare of the people, judges to be worthy of enactment, must be modified or even entirely abandoned by this same individual, because the Catholic Church frowns on or disapproves of them. He is bound to scrap them because the Catholic in him comes before the citizen. Which means that loyalty to his Church replaces that due to the State. In short, that he must bow before the laws of the Church by forsaking those of the State, thus acting as a Catholic first and as a citizen second.

Occurrences of this kind are by no means rare. They happen more frequently than is generally realized. And the lengths to which the loyalty of a Catholic administrator can be stretched, by the demands of his Church, would seem unbelievable were they not true.

A most striking example occurred in Catholic Ireland.

Some time in 1949 the Irish Government appointed Dr. Noel Browne Minister of Health. Within eighteen months the new Minister had reorganized, improved, and streamlined the Irish Health Service to a degree never achieved before. He had abolished queueing for tubercular treatment, provided financial help for tubercular patients and their dependants, provided sanatorium treatment for all waiting patients. He launched a £20,000,000 hospital scheme, designed to give Ireland one of

the most up-to-date hospital services in the world. This comprised a national cancer service, a nutritional survey, and, last but not least, a Mother and Child scheme. In fact, the last was the most important of all. The reason was an obvious one: Ireland's infantile death-rate was the blackest reproach to the Irish nation, being the worst in the whole of Europe. During the previous fifty years all other countries had at least halved the death-rate, many bringing it down by more than three-quarters. "Ireland alone is a clear exception to this rule," stated a World Health Organization report, based upon the dramatic disclosure that Ireland's death-rate was still seventy-five per cent of the rate common at the end of the last century—an infantile death-rate nearly treble that of England and Wales—i.e. eighty-three per thousand against thirty.

It was this incredible infant-sacrifice that had prompted the Health Minister to begin his new Mother and Child scheme. The scheme was designed to give medical services free to all mothers and children, without any Means Test, to provide mothers with specialist gynæcological care, and to give health education to both. To avoid friction with the religious authorities, the Health Minister specified in advance that the "education" would be physical and not moral. Doctors, it was directed, were to help in the promotion of these new measures.

As in Britain and the U.S.A., so also in Ireland, the medical profession was once more true to its reputation and proved to be far more concerned with money-making than with social welfare. Strongly objecting to the free-for-all medical scheme, it put up a most rabidly bitter opposition. The Health Minister, having guessed the medical reaction, had already taken steps to circumvent their objections, steps which enabled him confidently to go ahead with the scheme.

At this point, again as in Britain and the U.S.A., the Irish medical profession found its cause championed by a most formidable ally: the Catholic Church. The Irish hierarchy came challengingly to the fore, lined up against the Health Minister, and defiantly declared themselves opposed to the Mother and Child scheme. Their reason: the scheme "constituted a ready-made instrument of totalitarian aggression."

In a democracy any individual or group has the right to

support or to oppose the State's measures, particularly when convinced that democratic tenets are endangered. Their Lordships, the Irish bishops, therefore, were within their rights in opposing the scheme. Which they did. But when the hierarchy came to the fore to save Irish democracy from "a ready-made instrument of totalitarian aggression," in the name of a dictatorship, then even the most light-hearted Irishman, particularly if married and once or repeatedly a father, was bound to raise an eyebrow at their Lordships' unexpected democratic crusading fervour.

The Mother and Child scheme had been condemned by them, not in obedience to the clamour of the poor Irish expectant mothers, indignantly objecting to the State's wanting them to have all the care and attention that all prospective mothers are entitled to have, but because the scheme did not fit in with the dicta of a bachelor in Rome—namely, with the teaching of the Pope.

According to Papal injunctions, the right to provide for the health of children belonged to the parents, and not to the State. Their Lordships, from the very start, made this quite clear in their declarations. Whether the parents could or could not pay the stiff medical fees, or even feed their children properly, their Lordships did not even deign to mention. Theirs is the care of souls, not of bodies.

The decrees of the Church having to be blindly obeyed, the Mother and Child scheme had to be wholly scrapped, was their verdict. This on the ground that "it would deprive ninety per cent of parents of their rights, because of ten per cent of negligent or necessitous parents." To tax the whole community "on the pretext of relieving the necessitous ten per cent was iniquitous," they declared, with genuine Christian compassion.

Thereupon, making a truly exceptional gesture, they paid a generous tribute to democratic practice and graciously condescended to enlighten with a few explanations those—the majority—whose minds had been rendered opaque to the light of Catholic theology by villainous convictions. Among these, that a bunch of scarlet-robed bachelors like their Lordships knew nothing about motherhood, family, and all the responsibilities connected with not only conceiving, but caring for, feeding, clothing, and educating children in a practical fashion,

and not in the abstract, from desolately silent episcopal palaces.

Papal teaching rules that physical education, in addition to religious education, belongs to the family and not to the State, the hierarchy emphasized. Education in connexion with motherhood implied instruction concerning sex-relations, marriage, chastity, and like matters. This was not the competence of the Health Minister or, even less, of the State, because it was that of the Church. Gynæcological care must not be given to any Irish mother by the State because it might include provision for birth control, birth limitation, abortion, and so on, practices wholly condemned by the Church. Finally, their Lordships ruled against the Health Scheme because "the elimination of private medical practitioners by a State-paid service has not been shown to be necessary or even advantageous to the patient, the public, and, above all, to the medical profession."¹

That was not all. Their Lordships, in matters of authority, are exceedingly practical people. After their outright rejection of the scheme, they set up an inquisitorial court, composed of the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Ferns, and the Bishop of Galway. Thereupon, having summoned the Health Minister before it, they duly interrogated him. Dr. Browne explained. The scheme did not go against any teaching of the Catholic Church, their Excellencies could rest assured. He was a Catholic himself, and had thought out very carefully all the implications involved in the Mother and Child scheme. He rebutted the hierarchy's argument, point by point. First, the "ten per cent" were really *a third* of the population, who were receiving medical aid under Means Test, from public authorities or charities. Secondly, "education" would be limited to telling expectant mothers only about diet and pre-natal habits—e.g. "no smoking." Gynæcological care did not imply the teaching of birth control, family planning, or abortion, but would be limited only to difficulties arising out of "mis-managed pregnancies."

The Irish hierarchy had the patience to listen, and then, having dismissed the Health Minister, they summoned before their Tribunal none other than the Irish Prime Minister. Mr. John Costello, the Premier of a democratically elected Govern-

ment, representing an independent nation, did not object to the summons. On the contrary, flattered, he informed the members of the Irish Parliament how the Archbishop of Dublin had "kindly sent for" him. The hierarchy had condemned the scheme, he told the House, therefore the Irish Government, having decided to comply with the hierarchy's command, had to reject the Mother and Child Health Service launched by Dr. Browne.

Dr. Browne once more pointed out to both his lay and his hierarchical opponents that no one was compelled to use the scheme. To prove his case—namely, that there was no new principle involved—he reminded them that the Mother and Child scheme now proposed by him had originally derived from an Act of the De Valera Government some years before. What Dr. Browne did not say, however, was the fact known by most members that the scheme had never been implemented because of the Irish Catholic Ministers' fear of defying the hierarchy's opposition.

His explanations were in vain. His ministerial colleagues, to a man, disowned him. His Party, in whose programme there loomed prominent the Means Test, publicly repudiated him.

The Irish Prime Minister had to forgo his rights and duties as the citizen of an independent nation and as a member of a democratically elected Government in order not to violate his allegiance to his Church. "As a Catholic, I obey my Church authorities, and will continue to do so," he declared to the members of Parliament. "There is going to be no flouting of the Bishops on Catholic morals and social teaching," confirmed the Irish Labour Leader, Mr. William Norton. "In Ireland a conflict between the spiritual and temporal authorities is damaging to national unity," added Mr. MacBride, the Party Leader and External Affairs Minister, brusquely ordering his Ministerial and Party colleague, Dr. Browne, to surrender his office.

At such mass surrender to the dicta of the Catholic Church numerous leading members, including Deputies of the Dail, resigned outright their Party allegiance in protest against such unbelievable behaviour. The last straw, however, had yet to come:

As a Catholic, I accept the ruling of their Lordships, the Hierarchy, without question,

finally declared Dr. Browne himself, rescinding the Health Service and resigning.²

At this, several daring Deputies got up in Parliament and openly protested that the Government of a democratic country was not being exercised by the elected representatives of the people, but by bishops meeting secretly and enforcing their views on ministers and hence on the whole nation.³

But the will of the Church had prevailed. And that was that.

When the Bishops made their declaration on the moral principles involved in a proposed scheme [commented a leading Catholic organ in England], its promoter immediately recognized their right to speak on the subject, and accepted it as axiomatic that the Government would not wish to do what the Church considered wrong.⁴

“It is absolutely right and just,” declared another.⁵

The moral implication of this astounding Irish case was but one: the laws of the Catholic Church were above those of the State. “We wish that were true of contemporary England,” was the revealing comment of the English hierarchy.⁶

“We wish that were true of our country” is the perennial wish of all the Catholic hierarchies the world over. And theirs is anything but a mere wish. It is the very spirit by which all their exertions are intrinsically impregnated; the ultimate objective of all their ceaseless activities. As such, it should not be lightly dismissed. For, as the Irish hierarchy have so forcibly demonstrated, the heavy hand of the Catholic Church can still foil the will of the people, wherever and whenever her hierarchies are permitted to speak with an authority which should, and must, belong only to the State.

In the Irish case the Church, having enforced her laws above those of the State, compelled her members to act as Catholics first and as citizens second. There are cases, however, when she boldly claims that a Catholic's first allegiance is due to her simply because he is a Catholic. Hence that a Catholic, in virtue of his being a Catholic, must obey the laws of the

Church and disregard those of the State, should the latter claim to come first.

Such a claim is put forward not only when both the citizens and the State are Catholic: they are made independently of the religious affiliation of the civil authority or government.

A case in point occurred in Malta.

Malta is a Catholic island. It has a predominantly Catholic population. It is frequently governed by a predominantly Catholic government. But Malta is also a British colony, and hence it is under Protestant rulership.

At the time of the contest the British Governor who was acting as the Maltese Prime Minister happened to be a Catholic himself. The case, therefore, assumed an exceptional significance in that, while the disputed citizen was a Catholic, the Maltese Prime Minister, also a member of the Church, was acting simultaneously as the British Governor representing the mandatory power—i.e. Protestant England.

Unlike the previous case, here Catholic individuals refused to put loyalty to their Church first. The Church's reaction deserves close attention, as it brought to light the question of Church and State in its crudest form, the significance of Catholic claims being even more ominous than in the Irish example.

Towards the end of 1928 Father G. Micallef, a Franciscan friar, was banished by his Superior from Malta to Sicily. The friar, believing the banishment unfair, refused to leave and appealed to the Government for protection. The Government accepted the appeal and passed a resolution asking the Vatican to appoint a representative to inquire into the case. The resolution was duly adopted by the Legislative Assembly on January 24, 1929. Two months later, in March, the Prime Minister, Lord Strickland, quashed the sentence, on the grounds that a British subject could not be expelled from British territory by a "foreign power"—i.e. the Vatican.

The incident brought to the fore, in concrete form, the old slippery question of the power of the Church *vis-à-vis* that of the State. Following the quashing of the sentence, the Head of the Maltese hierarchy came into the open and publicly denounced the action taken by Lord Strickland. This resulted in all the churches on the island soon echoing with denuncia-

tions of the Government. Lord Strickland protested that, this being a legal issue affecting the authority of the State, the attacks made against him from all pulpits were unfair and unjust. The Maltese hierarchy, he claimed, were not justified in their behaviour and were exploiting their religious powers in a purely legal issue between Church and State. Thereupon he appealed to the Vatican.

The following month, April, the Vatican sent an Apostolic Delegate to investigate the case. The Apostolic Delegate's conclusion: the Maltese Government was in the wrong. His advice to the Maltese bishops: continue to fight Lord Strickland. Lord Strickland appealed to the Vatican against the Apostolic Delegate. The Vatican replied in the person of none other than its Secretary of State. His verdict: Lord Strickland was in the wrong. His orders: the Maltese hierarchy must continue and increase their pressure upon the Government, whose decision was absolutely inconsistent with the authority due to the Church.

Lord Strickland rejected the decision of the Vatican's Secretary of State and went in person to Rome, where he asked to be received by the Pope. The Pope refused to see him.

Lord Strickland, determined to put his case before public opinion in spite of his Church, wrote a memorandum, setting down the Government's case and disowning the decisions of the Maltese bishops, of the Apostolic Delegate, and of the Secretary of State. The memorandum was widely publicized, and additional fuel was thus added to the fire. Once Lord Strickland was back in Malta, a resolution against ecclesiastical interference in civil matters was passed by the Legislature that same month, with a strongly worded protest signed by all the Maltese Ministers, which was forwarded to London, for transmission to the Pope.

The British Government, after having pondered over the case, in August lodged an even stronger protest at the Vatican. The Vatican, as a reply, ordered the Maltese hierarchy to tighten still more the screws on the Maltese Government. On December 11 the Archbishop of Malta threatened with the severest penalties anyone, Catholic priest or layman, who should maintain that the Government was right and the Church was wrong.

The situation began to go from bad to worse. A few days later the Prime Minister reviewed the situation in the Chamber, referring the gravity of the issue to the British Government. The British Government, hoping to reach some kind of compromise, began negotiating for a Concordat for Malta. The Vatican proved as uncompromising as it was with the Maltese Government, and soon the negotiations reached a deadlock. Great Britain made it clear that, unless the Vatican ordered its priests in Malta to cease interfering with the political life of the island, the British Government would not consider reaching any agreement with the Church, via either a Concordat, a *modus vivendi*, or in any other way. The Vatican, as a counter-reply, asked the British Government for the dismissal of Lord Strickland.

The British Government refused, and ordered Lord Strickland to continue in his policy. The Vatican commanded the Maltese Church to increase its pressure still further. On May 1, 1930, the Archbishop of Malta issued a letter to all the Catholic clergy, ordering them to refuse the sacraments to anyone who should vote for, or intended to vote for or support, Lord Strickland's Party in the coming elections. To give a vote to Lord Strickland or his Government, warned the Archbishop, would be "a mortal sin."

This, it should be noted, was not the beginning, but the culmination of the religious pressure which the Maltese hierarchy had been conducting for some time, using purely religious instruments—e.g. the confessional. Priests had, in fact, for months been telling their penitents to oppose a Government which was against the Church. A misuse of religion, this, which solicited protests, even from many Catholics.

The Maltese Government declared the interference of the Catholic Church intolerable, stating that the Archbishop's order amounted to an open interference with the liberty of parliamentary elections, and, indeed, was tantamount to a claim to make and unmake ministers and governments. And they appealed to the British Crown.

On May 30 the British Government gave an ultimatum to the Vatican's Secretary of State. Unless the Vatican withdrew its ever more pressing demands that the Maltese Premier be

removed from office, unless it restored complete freedom to the Maltese electorate by ordering the Maltese hierarchy to lift the excommunication penalty, unless it withdrew the astounding claim that Catholic priests must not be sued before a lay tribunal without ecclesiastical permission, the British Government would take appropriate measures and, indeed, was determined to stop all kinds of negotiations with the Vatican itself.

The Maltese hierarchy renewed their war, and within a short period succeeded in bringing the Catholic population to such a fever-pitch that an attempt was made on the life of Lord Strickland, who escaped unhurt.

Members of the Government and many Catholics proposed that a Service of Thanksgiving for Lord Strickland's safety should be given in the Cathedral. The Archbishop promptly refused to comply with this request and prevented the service from taking place.

The British Government, in view of the uncompromising attitude of the Vatican, which stubbornly refused to withdraw its religious blackmail of the Maltese electorate, rather than have the election under Catholic pressure, postponed it and, in June, 1930, suspended the Constitution.

On that same day—and this was no coincidence—the Pope summoned all cardinals present in Rome and, during a solemn allocution, repeated once more in Papal parlance that the authority of the Catholic Church was definitely and unalterably above that of the State, and that all Catholics were conscience-bound to obey their Church first, and to fight the State when this was opposed to the laws of the Church.

The issue had become that of the old fight between the claims of the Church and those of a modern government, with all its wider implications. The problem found its way again into the House of Commons in Britain, where it was amply discussed and debated.

In June, 1932, Lord Strickland startled many of his supporters, both in Malta and in England, by declaring that he had been wrong in opposing the claims of the Catholic Church. More, he went out of his way to make a formal apology to the Vatican for his past opposition. Lord Strickland, the unyielding defender of the authority of the State, had

thus been ignominiously defeated by Lord Strickland, the pious member of his Church. A Prime Minister had been compelled to meet his Canossa, as an individual Catholic under the spiritual duress of his Church. Another striking reminder that Catholics are Catholics first and that, even when considering the authority of the State as paramount, to save their souls they are forced by their spiritual leader to disown the civil authorities to whom all loyal citizens should owe undisputed allegiance.

.

To believe that the Irish and Maltese cases are exceptions would be to make the gravest of errors. They are typical instances of the attitude put forward by the Catholic Church in connexion with her unabated claim that the allegiance of all her members is due to her first and to the State second.

Such claims are as binding on Catholics of today as they were on the Irish in 1950, or on the Maltese in 1930, or, indeed, on the German emperors in the thirteenth century, or for all Catholics before them. Having remained basically unchanged, they are not confined to specific cases. They violate the loyalty of each individual Catholic, whether a member of a Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, or non-Christian profession, community, State, or race. These claims are not theoretical; they are specific, concrete, and real. As such, they ask obedience in specific, concrete, and real problems affecting the authority of the State, which Catholics must forgo, disregard, and repudiate to obey the commands of their Church.

That the Catholic Church should dare to put forward such claims upon all her members—who are simultaneously citizens of a society harbouring sovereign communities, regulated by the authority of the modern State—and that there should be individuals who take her authority as being above that of the State, and consequently must be ready to obey it first, even if by so doing they go against the State, is no less true because it is astounding.

Concrete instances are countless. Catholic laws can force Catholics to violate the laws of the civil authorities whether they are street-sweepers or judges of the Supreme Court.

It might be more useful if, perhaps, instead of selecting a

case at random, we choose a profession which, by its very nature, could not be more intimately connected with the observance and enforcement of the laws of the State: the profession of the Magistracy.

Magistrates and judges, whether at the lowest or at the highest step of the ladder, by the mere fact that they are members of the judicial profession are in conscience bound, perhaps more than any other citizen, not to forgo the laws of the State. More, to observe them to the utmost of their capacity, as individuals, as members of the legal profession, as civil magistrates, as officials of the State, as dispensers of the State's justice, as enforcers of the State's authority, and, last but not least, as the most loyal, incorruptible and trustworthy servants of the State.

A magistrate who is a Catholic, however, cannot be any of these things. No State can trust him to be either loyal, incorruptible, or trustworthy. Even less to dispense, administer, and enforce its laws as impartially as justice demands. Reason: the magistrate is not a citizen-magistrate first; he is a Catholic member of his Church first, a citizen-magistrate second.

Hence the laws which he must administer are not above all. They are under those of his Church. When they conflict with the latter he must forgo those of the State, which he is supposed to enforce, in order to implement those of his Church.

The Catholic who is also a magistrate or a judge, therefore, by obeying his Church first, becomes a disloyal citizen, a treacherous magistrate, and a betrayer of the trust bestowed upon him by the State.

This is so because the obligation applicable to all Catholics—blind obedience to their Church as the ultimate authority in “faith and morals”—is applicable equally to them. In addition to which they must obey injunctions specifically applicable to the juridical profession, in so far as their Church claims to be the ultimate authority also in the juridical field, because “juridical activity remains included in fullness in the Church's life,” as Pope Pius XII declared.⁷

What is the real meaning of this? That the Catholic who is also a judge must obey the laws of his Church instead of those of the State; must apply the laws of his Church upon the citizens of the State that employs him as a judge to enforce the

State's laws, not upon citizens who are Catholics or members of any other Church, but upon citizens who are subject only to the laws of the State and not to the laws of any specific denomination.

One typical injunction whose concreteness is its most specific attribute is the one compelling Catholic judges—all Catholic judges, it should be noted—to disregard the laws of the State in obedience to those of the Catholic Church. Here is the official Papal pronouncement:

A judge may never oblige any person to perform an act contrary to the law of God or of His Church [read, the Catholic Church]. . . . Wherefore he cannot pronounce a penal sentence which would be equivalent to approval of such a law.⁸

In other words, Catholic judges, whether citizens of a Communist, Democratic, Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, or even non-Christian nation, are explicitly forbidden to obey the laws of their country if such laws do not harmonize with those of their Church.

Now, should a government engaged in certain overdue reforms pass laws which, in the eyes of the Catholic Church, are wrong, what happens? A Catholic judge charged by the State to implement its laws is conscience-bound to forfeit the laws of the State, because his Church does not approve of them.

The Chinese Communists, while fighting their way to power, implemented long-overdue agrarian reforms, seizing land, redistributing it to small cultivators, reducing taxation—e.g. from the fifty per cent to eighty per cent of peasant crops under Chiang Kai Shek to fifteen per cent under Mao-Tse-Tung⁹—a policy, this, which they legalized throughout China once they were installed in Peking. A Chinese Catholic judge—and there still were Chinese Catholic judges—refused to carry out such laws, because his Church declared them unjust.

It might be said that China is a non-Christian land and that a Catholic judge is an exception. Let us return to Europe. Similar land reforms were carried out, also following the Second World War, in Hungary, where only 12,000 land-owners owned more than half the land. One-third of the agricultural land was given to 642,000 peasant families, each peasant family receiving about seven and a half acres. The

Catholic Church put up a furious resistance, proclaiming the land-reform laws unfair, unjust, and a breach of the most sacred laws of God and man. Catholic judges sitting on Hungarian benches, after such a condemnation, were conscience-bound to regard the laws of the Hungarian State as unlawful and hence refuse to implement them.

The fact that the Catholic Church, behind her high-sounding moral principles, very often hides the crudest self-interest is ignored altogether. This was proved in the case of the Hungarian land-reforms, where the Church's high moral indignation had been prompted, not by theoretical claims of aloof justice, but by the concrete fact that she was herself the largest single landowner in the whole of Hungary, owning nothing less than 1,128,000 acres of the best land. Most of it was in large estates owned by the bishops, abbots, and higher clergy. Additional, but not coincidental, to this first interesting disclosure was a second. The next largest Hungarian landowner, after the Church, was one of her most devout sons, a member of the nobility and an intimate friend of the Hungarian Cardinal Primate, as we shall see later on. The Hungarian Government, although claiming to be inspired neither by Christian nor by Catholic principles, and although composed of Communists, Agnostics, and Atheists, acted on genuine, unadulterated Christian doctrines. Having distributed the seized land to landless peasants, it left the by no means despicable figure of 100,000 acres to their Lordships, the Hungarian hierarchy, plus 25,000 acres to be equally distributed among the very poor Catholic clergy. To the humble followers of Jesus Christ of the first few centuries this would have meant Christianity in action. To the Christians of the twentieth century it was unjust, diabolical, and anti-Christian. The Pope, from the splendours of the Vatican, prohibited Catholics to support such laws under pain of hell-fire, and thereupon ruled that Catholic judges must not implement them, lest they be unfavourably judged in the Last Judgment.

It might be objected that the Chinese and Hungarian Governments, whether they acted like the primitive Christians or not, were not Christian, and therefore were *ipso facto* in the wrong. Although such an objection could not stand any serious challenge were it pointed out that governments com-

posed entirely of Catholics expropriated all the land and property of the Catholic Church, in the last and also in this century, in precisely the same manner as did the Communists, and in such Catholic countries as France, Italy, and Portugal, a less objectionable example might assuage the consciences of the most scrupulous. Let us, therefore, take a case where the dicta of the Catholic Church are enforced upon and against those of the State, not in any Asiatic or European country enacting exceptionally drastic laws, to cope with exceptionally abnormal situations, but indiscriminately everywhere.

Most countries throughout the world, Christian and non-Christian, have legalized divorce. Laws have been passed to that effect. Judges employed by the State must implement such laws. Divorce cannot be called either a drastic, exceptional, or unjust measure taken unilaterally by the modern State enacting laws hostile to human or divine justice. The majority of the human race have accepted it as a fair institution. Except for the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church has condemned it. Hence Catholic judges must not accept, grant, or legalize it.

The Pope leaves no doubts about it:

To take a particular case [he said], a Catholic judge cannot pronounce a sentence of civil divorce, when it is a question of a marriage that is valid before God and His Church.¹⁰

In other words, Catholic judges, whether in super-Catholic Fascist Spain, in mixed Calvinistic, Lutheran, Catholic Switzerland, in Protestant England, the United States, or in non-Christian Japan, are barred from granting divorce in *all valid marriages*. By so doing a judge or a lawyer who disobeys the laws of his country in order to obey those of his Church is, to quote the Pope once more, "the ideal of a perfect lawyer."

These declarations aroused the gravest concern in political and legal circles everywhere, and, in fact, created a commotion, particularly in Britain and the U.S.A.

But this is not all. Non-Catholic governments, judges, and lawyers had taken it for granted that the Pope meant to have such a rule applied only when Catholic judges dealt with specifically Catholic marriages. In reply to the many inquiries to this effect, the Vatican came forth with one of the most

ominous declarations made for centuries. It officially stated that the Catholic Church was empowered to prohibit divorce of Protestants as well. Replying to questions put by American bishops, the Holy Office decreed that baptism conferred by Protestant sects is valid as Catholic baptism in the eyes of the Catholic Church.¹¹ The ruling meant that Catholic judges are barred from granting divorce to Protestants, whose baptism is recognized as valid and whose marriage is therefore accepted.

Catholics in office in Protestant countries, consequently, must disobey the law of the State, not solely when dealing with other Catholics, but also when dealing with Protestants who recognize divorce, and who submit to the law of the State, while an authority which they refuse to recognize—i.e. the Catholic Church—tells them that they must obey her laws, and not those of their country.

These are the claims of the pre-Reformation, put forward in concrete shape in the twentieth century.

Their gravity is soon realized when it is remembered that in Protestant countries Catholics have reached the highest legal positions. In the U.S.A. there are High Court judges who are Catholics. In England no fewer than three High Court judges were Catholics at the time of such decrees.¹²

The ruling of the Pope was meant, and was taken, literally in Catholic and in Protestant countries. In Catholic Peru the Society of Catholic Lawyers, led by the Supreme Court Chief Justice and Judges, pledged themselves to carry out their duty "in accordance with Catholic morality," while in Protestant England Catholic lawyers were called upon "to uphold the solid Christian doctrine of the law of God as against the supremacy of man."¹³

Some Catholics rebelled against such a conception, and were promptly reprimanded—e.g. District Judge Luis Armijo, from Las Vegas, N.M., who, on hearing of the Pope's ruling, summed up his reaction with a curt comment: "I may be a Catholic," he declared, "but I am a citizen of the U.S.A. first." "Judge Armijo," wrote a leading American Catholic organ, one of the foremost American authorities on such matters, "in fourteen short words has managed to distort the meaning both of what it is to be a Catholic and what it is to be a U.S. citizen. . . . Being a Catholic . . . involves such things as personal con-

viction, belief, and conscience. When a man is a Catholic, it should be because he couldn't be anything else and remain true to himself. Obviously that comes first. The real glory attached to being a citizen of the U.S.A. is that it always comes second. *Being a Catholic comes first.* That is what being a Catholic means. Being a citizen of the U.S.A. comes second."¹⁴

That is precisely the position of every Catholic citizen, in whichever country he lives. His claim is based upon the fact that "the Church of Christ is wholly independent of every civil power . . . possessing power peculiar to herself, both legislative and judicial."¹⁵ Furthermore, that "the faithful, whenever found, are subject to the Church, and not to the will of the State."¹⁶ While the Pope is "the Supreme Judge, even of civil laws, and therefore is incapable of being under any true obligation to them."¹⁷ Consequently, "the Christian people, *to whatever nation they belong*, if subjects of the State as things temporal, are also subjects of the Pope as things spiritual, *and more of the Pope than of the State.*"¹⁸

As already mentioned, this applies not only to Catholics, but also to Orthodox and to Protestants, because "every baptized person is more the subject of the Pope than he is of any earthly governor whatever."¹⁹

Concluding, no matter what the individual Catholic may say, the essence of his status in the eyes of his Church is that, whether he is a judge, a lawyer, a doctor, or, indeed, anything else, he automatically is a member of the Church first, and a citizen of his country second.

These portentous claims are not confined to specific matters concerning "faith and morals." They trespass into the political field, on the ground that issues dealing with faith and morals touch political problems. Hence the obligation on the part of Catholics to follow the dicta of their Church on purely political ground, and the enforcement of the Church's laws upon her members also in the political field.

One of these, as already mentioned, was the decree issued against Catholics who supported or belonged to the Communist party, or who approved of any Communist government or even wrote in or read Communist papers; anyone doing that

being excommunicated, deprived of the sacraments and association with the faithful.²⁰

Like Catholic decrees in other fields, this one also did not remain merely theoretical. Being a concrete injunction, it produced concrete reverberations. For, as a result of it, thousands of Catholics in many lands had to boycott a political movement because the Church did violence to their religious feeling. That is, they had to abandon a political credo to maintain a religious one. As long as the dilemma was confined to where Communist parties were one of the many parties, the conflict remained almost academic, although with not inconsiderable political results. But when the 60,000,000 Catholics living under Communist governments in North, Central, and Eastern Europe or in China tried to follow their Church's instructions, then the loyalty test became more ominous. They had to consider whether they were members of the Church first and citizens of their country second. If loyalty to the Church came first, then they had to be disloyal to the State. If the State came first, then they had to be disloyal to their Church. Many had no doubts and, considering themselves members of the Church first, opposed the party, the government, and the State by words and deeds, and the law of the State fell upon them. The vast majority were put in a painful dilemma and tried somehow to evade the issue by a vague, tacit, if awkward, acceptance of both. Others, a minority, considered themselves citizens of their country first and members of the Church second, and were promptly excommunicated.

To those who consider a Communist State a tyranny, the attitude of the Catholic Church to Communism, and the behaviour of those who obey her decrees instead of those of a Communist State, are not only praiseworthy but commendable. Any lover of freedom should approve of such a Catholic attitude. This argument loses some of its potency, however, when it is remembered that the Catholic Church used the same anathemas, prohibitions, and religious pressure to destroy what only half a century ago she branded as the "godless" enemies of religion, of freedom, of society, and, indeed, of the human race: namely, the principles of Separation of Church and State, of Liberalism, and even of Democracy. These ideologies,

“worse than pestilence” then to the Catholic Church, were exactly what Communism is now.

The argument is further weakened when it is pointed out that the Catholic Church does not exert her authority only when dealing with Communist “tyrannies.” She claims it to be her divine right to exercise the same pressure to enforce her laws upon Catholics who are citizens of democratic countries, as the instances of Malta, Ireland, and of judges everywhere have clearly proved. The result is that Catholics, to obey their Church’s orders, must become disloyal to their democratic governments, to democratic principles, and to the community—in short, to the society standing upon tenets proclaiming the freedom of conscience, of worship, of speech, and so on.

Consequently it follows that the Pope, by forcing Catholics to obey his injunctions, does violence to the democratic convictions and duties of citizens who are Catholics, and hence to the democratic functioning of a democratic society.

In this manner, Catholics, by obeying a political authority surrounded by the aura of a religious one, which is frequently hostile to the interests of a democratic government, do actively forgo democracy, become actively disloyal to democratic tenets and practice, and, indeed, turn into potential destroyers of and frequently traitors to that same democratic society to which they should give their loyalty first.

This, not because they are individually or intentionally hostile to the State as such, but simply because they have to submit to the lead of an alien political leader who, via religious and moral pressure, can employ them to further the interests of the Catholic Church, which they must put before any racial, political, or party allegiance whatsoever.

This many will deny, arguing that there are numerous Catholics who do not look to the Pope for guidance, except in purely religious matters, but pursue independent policies of their own. Which is correct. But only up to a point. For, were we to ask them whether they accept the Pope, unquestioningly and blindly, as their supreme religious leader—that is, in his capacity of Supreme Head of the Catholic Church—they will give an emphatic reply in the affirmative.

In the light of this, let us quote the formula in which the Pope declares himself infallible. He is infallible when he

“defines a doctrine regarding faith and *morals*.” We have already pointed out how certain moral issues are so intimately inter-related with ethical and social ones that at times they are inseparable. In the case of divorce, or education, or Mother and Child schemes, for instance. The majority of these problems ultimately are bound to become essentially political in character and function. For instance, the Catholic Church may tell a Catholic that it is his duty to disobey laws which are hostile to Catholicism, which endanger the Church or go against his religious convictions. Or, in extreme cases, she tells him that it is his duty to revolt against the civil authorities who enact such laws.

It is true that, once these moral issues assume a preponderantly social or political character, a Catholic is no longer compelled blindly to follow the Pope, but is at liberty to use his own reason. Such freedom can be applied only to minor details, however. The fundamental tenets must remain intact. Which means that Catholics, whether they like it or not, ultimately must submit to, follow, and obey the dicta of their Church in the political and ideological fields, independently of whether or not such dicta make him a rebel against the State of which he is an intrinsic part, as an individual citizen.

The Pope, therefore, when seen in this light, is a power above all powers, a law above all laws, whose decrees can, via religion, influence, shape, transform, and create the most serious commotion in the internal and external policies of any given nation.

Catholics, consequently, cannot be loyal citizens. They are a potential fifth-column, potential traitors to the State of which they are citizens, potential rebels against the society of which they are members. This, in virtue of the essence of their religious tenets and of the binding allegiance they owe to their religious leader.

Such conclusions, ominously enough, were drawn by none other than a small minority of bishops convened at Rome to attend the Vatican Council (1870) and who were opposed to the proclamation of Papal Infallibility on these grounds.

“It has become abundantly evident,” they said, in a petition which they presented to the Pope himself and which was kept secret for many years,

that every Catholic whose actions are ruled by the faith he professes is a BORN ENEMY OF THE STATE, since he finds himself bound in conscience to contribute as far as in him lies to the subjection of all nations and kings to the Roman Pontiff.²¹

That this statement is not exaggerated the Chancelleries, the State Departments, and the Foreign Offices of many countries of Europe, America, and Asia could well testify and, indeed, prove.

An antagonism is thus produced between the State and the Catholic Church, who lays claim to universal supremacy and jurisdiction over persons and institutions altogether inconsistent with the independence of nations, the sovereignty of the State, and the temporal authority of society.

This antagonism, far from diminishing, is increasing; and now, perhaps more than formerly, owing to rapidly sharpening claims of global economic systems and ideological allegiances, is liable to break forth openly upon any occasion when the Church may deem it expedient to risk or to provoke a collision.

The sum of this conflict between the authority of the State and the assumed supremacy of the Catholic Church is pithily set forth in the laconic interchange of civilities which took place in the year 1301 between Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair, of France:

Boniface, Bishop [wrote the Pope], Servant of the Servants of God, to Philip, King of the French.

Fear God and keep His commandments. We desire thee to take notice, that thou art subject to us both in spiritual and in temporal matters. . . . Those who think otherwise, we account heretics.

Philip [rejoined the King], by the grace of God, King of the French, to Boniface, who enacts the Sovereign Pontiff, small greeting or none.

Let thy superlative fatuity take notice, that we are subject to no one in temporal matters. . . . Those who think otherwise, we account fools and madmen.

Six and a half centuries later this antagonism is the same. The Pope still asserts his supremacy as far as he can and dare. To be sure, the Catholic Church at present tries to enforce her sovereignty upon the members of independent nations within the framework of certain principles which contemporary society has imposed upon the external relationship of organized religion

and secular authority. Yet her claims are fundamentally the same, and their enforcement, although not so obvious, is conducted with as much obstinacy and ruthlessness as ever.

The fact that they are made via spiritual terrorization and that they exert their pressure within the conscience of modern men should not minimize the Catholic Church's determination to implement her laws above those of the State.

The reality of her spiritual terrorization is proved by the concreteness of the power she has over 400,000,000 people. It must never be forgotten that it is through this that she can reach, promote, support, or condemn social and political issues which, although at first seemingly alien to religion, on closer scrutiny are intimately related to it. Armed with it, the Catholic Church can intervene whenever it pleases her in the domestic affairs of any given country, her extraordinary religious authority enabling her to exercise direct control over hundreds of millions of Catholics scattered within the borders of many independent nations. Such intervention by an ordinary State would not be tolerated, and would lead to serious complications. Pressure of political ideologies from abroad can and does promote the mobilization of a national or international coalition against them—e.g. against international Fascism before the Second World War and against Communism after that war. Nothing of that kind is mobilized against the Catholic Church. Yet the Catholic Church can intervene, whenever and wherever she likes, simultaneously within many independent States, with or without their permission. A thing which no modern State can do, except by war.

A State wanting to change its own social structure can do so only within its own borders, having no powers whatever outside them. This while simultaneously a neighbouring country might be enforcing opposite regulations on the same issue.

The Catholic Church, however, being a "landless and boundless power," has no such limitations. Should she decide, say, to condemn co-education or to prohibit the use of contraceptives, such a prohibition and condemnation must be accepted by all her members, whichever State they inhabit.

In this way she can influence social and political issues at will in any given nation. No State can accuse her of meddling

with its political problems without attacking her as a religious power. For she does not infringe the sovereign rights of any State. It is her duty, no less than her right, to lead the State's citizens in religious matters, and if the citizens feel compelled by religious duty to shape their social or political ideas and actions in accordance with their religion, so much the better. The Catholic Church, as such, cannot be blamed.

She never forcibly compels the citizens of any given country to move against their own will. If they act in accordance with her religious principles, their action is free. The Church, therefore, cannot be accused of interference by anyone.

It is mainly through loopholes of this nature that the Catholic Church can enter the political life of nations from which she would otherwise be excluded.

When she intervenes in politics in this manner—namely, under the cloak of religion—the modern State is helpless. It is unable to take the necessary measures to counteract her subtle political activity without infringing the religious liberty of its citizens. The democratic State, by its very fundamental principles of religious and political freedom, is more helpless than any other. For, were it to take measures to prevent Catholic interference in its internal affairs, the Church could claim with apparent reason that she was being persecuted as a religious institution which is above all politics. Were a State to try to pass laws legalizing birth control, for instance, all its Catholic citizens would be bound to do all in their power to prevent the passing of such laws. Further, it would be their duty to strive for the adoption by the nation of the doctrines concerning birth control preached by the Catholic Church.

Thus, through pressure from his religious convictions and the lead of his spiritual authority a Catholic trespasses into social and political fields. As a free individual, enjoying the same civic liberties as any other citizen with different religious or political views, he is, of course, within his rights in opposing, modifying, or supporting sundry laws. But the point is that he has become an active political instrument, bent on furthering certain social or political goals, *because of his religious principles*. Hence it is his religious convictions which ultimately are responsible for his final social and political attitude and, if not entirely, at least to a great extent, for his active participation

in the political life of his country. He thinks and acts in a certain way because his religious leader has ordered him to do so. Thus the ultimate instigator of the political actions of our Catholic citizen is the Catholic Church and her head, the Pope.

It might be argued that citizens of other religious denominations may act in the same way. Which is true. But it is certainly difficult to find another religion comparable with the Catholic Church in her role of direct instigator of pressing social and political problems. First, because no other great Church has so specifically condemned certain modern principles as has the Catholic Church; and, secondly, because practically every other Christian Church is more tolerant and does not exert such pressure on its members. Even if they did, their influence would be comparatively weak, owing to their lack of unity and mutual discord in ethical, social, and political problems.

This is true not only of Christian denominations but also of non-Christian religions, such as Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam. The following is a typical example.

In Persia, after the Government had nationalized the Abadan Oil Refineries (1951-2), there followed great economic and political complications. Influential Moslem religious leaders, such as Ayatollah Kashani, supported the Premier, who had implemented the nationalization. Others, such as Ayatollah Behbahani, one of the top twenty Moslem dignitaries of Persia, opposed him, because of his "unconstitutional measures." This on the ground that the Constitution laid down that the five leading Moslem dignitaries should participate in the Majlis (Parliament) sessions to ensure that Acts passed were in accordance with Moslem tenets. Because of their absence Behbahani maintained that all the parliamentary legislation was invalid.

Kashani, regardless of such protestations, declared that all good Moslems must support the Government. Its religious opponents retorted that all good Moslems must oppose it. Thirty Moslem Mullahs, as a protest against their own dissenting religious factions and the Government, took sanctuary in the Sepahsalar Mosque, adjacent to the Persian Government building. Pro-Government Moslems besieged the Mosque. The Mullahs who disagreed with them locked the Mosque gates. But within the Mosque not all Moslems agreed on

whether the tenets of the Moslem religion had or had not been violated, and one hundred pro-Government Moslem seminarians, protesting against the thirty Mullahs, attempted forcibly to eject them. There followed riots among the faithful.²²

A purely economic issue had been turned into a political and, finally, a religious one. In a country dominated by either Buddhism or Protestantism, the various Buddhist or Protestant leaders, facing a similar dilemma, would have split, on religious or on political grounds, and would have issued contradictory injunctions to their congregations, precisely as the Moslem religious leaders did. In a Catholic land—or, to be more precise, in any nation tackling the same problem, had such a problem seriously affected Catholic tenets or interests—Catholic reaction would have been different. The Catholics, far from becoming divided among themselves, would have had to follow precise directives from their local hierarchy or even straight from the Pope. Result: unlike Moslems, Buddhists, or Protestants, they would soon have formed a monolithic religious-political unit, to be carefully cultivated as a friend, and to be seriously feared as a most lethal foe.

The Catholic Church, consequently, cannot be compared with any other religion. For, thanks to her unity, determination, leadership, organizing power, religious and political machinery, and, above all, the blind obedience that millions owe to her, she can exert an extraordinarily heavy pressure upon all her members, so that, whether they know it or not, they automatically become potential political instruments in her hands: instruments to be used at any moment, in any country, irrespective of friendship or hostility between individuals, nations, or international institutions, provided her aims are furthered.

Owing to this, the political activities of Catholics of any given country, be they organized or not, should be the object of special attention by any watchful State, as it is from their association with their Church that their social and political behaviour will ultimately be inspired.

What we have just examined, therefore, should force us to accept the fact that the Catholic Church is not only a great religious institution, but ultimately and to all intents and purposes a great and mighty political power.

8

AUTHORITY, DEMOCRACY, AND THE POPES

NATIONS, LIKE INDIVIDUALS, CHERISH most what has cost them most. Today, at the basis of every free State there are certain principles of liberty which have been gained only after a dreadful expenditure of blood. These principles have never been acknowledged by the Catholic Church.

Catholic tenets, dealing with the nature, duties, and rights of the citizen in a modern State and of the State in a modern society, are not only antagonistic to democracy, they are fundamentally incompatible with its doctrines and practice.

Their incompatibility is as ineradicable as the foundation upon which they are based: namely, that Catholicism is the only repository of truth, and hence the unique teacher of the human race.

Owing to this, concepts such as government by the people, or the equality of religions, being profoundly alien to its spirit, are ruthlessly ignored, stultified, and repudiated.

Catholic antagonism is not superficial. It is basic. It lies in what is the very foundation of a democratic society: authority.

That society needs authority both Catholicism and the

modern State admit. Where they disagree is on the question of the origin and purpose of such authority. And on this they are poles apart. For, whereas the former insists that authority derives from a divine source, the latter asserts that it springs from the people, and hence that it is of earthly origin.

The author of nature, says the Church, is God. Persons and institutions holding authority, hold it in trust for God Himself.¹ The assertion that it resides in the free will of men is pernicious and false. For "the origin of public power," as many Popes have asserted, "is to be sought for in God Himself, and not in the multitude."¹

Notwithstanding this, modern men have erected their political systems contrary to that basic tenet of Catholicism. The Popes claim that men by so doing "have usurped a freedom more generous than just." Indeed, they have gone so far as to "set themselves to construct theories about the origin and nature of the State according to their fancy, and even to declare that all authority comes from the people, so that those who exercise authority in the State do so as exercising not what is their own but what has been entrusted to them by the people."² And, in addition, they even advocate such pernicious doctrines as that because "all men are alike by race and nature, so in like manner all are equal in the control of their life; that each one is so far his own master that each is free to think on every subject just as he may choose. . . . Government in a society based on such maxims is nothing more nor less than the will of the people, and the people . . . is its own ruler."³ Such a notion is not only absurd, it is intrinsically wicked and wholly wrong, says the Church. And it is wrong not only because, in such a government, "the authority of God is passed over in silence, as if there could be a government whose whole origin and power did not reside in God Himself," but, above all, because it would be ruled by "a multitude which is its own master and ruler."³

A people cannot rule itself. It has neither the capacity nor the right to do so. It has no authority; hence it cannot confer authority upon others. The modern theory that people can choose their government and grant power is, therefore, false. In elections the people selects its rulers, but is not entitled to grant them authority: "Such selection points out the ruler; it

does not confer the rights of rulership; nor is authority then handed over, but it is determined by whom authority shall be exercised.”⁴

Consequently the people cannot give authority, for if the theories expounded by the modern State were true, it would follow that authority is not divine, and, worse still, that it comes *from the people alone*. That must be condemned, warns the Church. For it is from such poisonous principles that the “pernicious doctrines of Socialism and Communism”⁴ have derived their main strength.

The government of a modern State, therefore, must accept the doctrine that its authority derives from God, and not from the people. Were a government to uphold the theory that “*the sovereignty of the people resides in the multitude*,” it would court disaster, say the Popes, for such a government would be in the power of the will of the people. And “if princes are nothing more than delegates chosen to carry out the will of the people . . . it necessarily follows that all things are as changeable as the will of the people, so that risk of public disturbance is ever hanging over our heads.”⁵

The people has no sovereignty, and the principle of the people being the source of power in the State is wrong, the Popes repeat:

The sovereignty of the people . . . is held to reside in the multitude. This is a doctrine . . . which lacks all reasonable proofs and all power of ensuring public safety and preserving order.⁶

Catholics, therefore, must oppose and reject such tenets, expressed in the formula that “the collective reason of the community should be the supreme guide in the management of all public affairs,” from which there springs that never-too-much abhorred fallacy which advocates “the doctrine of the supremacy of the greater number and that all right and all duty reside in the majority.”⁷

These are the basic Catholic tenets with regard to democracy. They could not be more fundamentally opposite to those upon which modern society is erected. No other religious, economic, or political system, including certain forms of Right- and Left-Wing totalitarianism, could be so deadly hostile to the democratic spirit and all for which it stands.

To declare that by the mere fact that a society is a democracy it is perfect would be absurd, to say the least. The faults of democracy are innumerable. The chasm between the ideal democracy inscribed in the constitutions of many countries and their practical application is enough to give perennial nightmares to its staunchest supporters.

That the "multitudes," as the Popes rather disparagingly label the people, are capable of ruling themselves, it must be admitted, is still mainly Utopia.

The most enlightened democracies in this respect have been a dismal failure—e.g. Americans sincerely hold their democracy to be the best in the world. By electing their own government, by selecting their own President, Senators, and Congressmen, they are convinced that it is they who determine the domestic and foreign policies of the United States. Theoretically this is true. In reality, however, it is only partly so. Particularly if it is pointed out how a fearful proportion of the electors who determine which party should go into power is fraught with such colossal ignorance as seemingly to justify the Papal abhorrence of rule by the masses.

A most striking instance of the abysmal incompetence of the democratic masses to rule themselves was given by the U.S.A. Following the Second World War, events which shook the world filled the annals of all nations. The U.S.A. itself in 1950 risked being dragged into a third World War by sending its armies racing towards Manchuria during the Korea conflict, when hundreds of thousands of American troops were fighting on Korean soil. At this period the U.S.A. sent a substantial portion of her navy to blockade Formosa, to protect Chiang Kai Shek, who, having been defeated by the Chinese Communists, had retired there with his Nationalist armies. Almost simultaneously, the U.S.A. promoted a grand Alliance, formed by the countries of Western Europe, called the Atlantic Pact, as a defensive-offensive war instrument against Soviet Russia. Prior to this, an ominous split in the Communist front, initiated by Tito, the Yugoslav dictator, made the U.S.A. profoundly alter its tactics. All such events were headline news for years throughout the world, including the U.S.A. Yet, when Americans were asked the following questions :

“Where is Formosa? Manchuria?”

“What is the Atlantic Pact?”

“Who is Chiang Kai Shek?”

“Who is Tito?”

one-fifth of adult Americans—that is to say, of American electors—who were asked these questions could not answer *a single one of them*.

This is not all. The United States, during these most fateful years, had Dean Acheson as one of its most controversial Secretaries of State. Yet, when adult Americans were asked who their present Secretary of State was, *one-third* did not know.⁸

The American future electors proved to be even less knowledgeable. During a survey conducted among 30,000 Los Angeles students, aged sixteen to eighteen, three per cent could not tell the time shown on a drawing of a clock.

Democracy has always been generous with time, and hence the failure of a mere three per cent could be by-passed. When, however, sixteen per cent of these same future vote-holders failed to locate their own home town on a map of California, while two per cent, although living in California, could not locate it on a map of the U.S.A., then to maintain that these individuals will act with the greatest wisdom in the conduct of the internal affairs of American democracy is to advocate a very poor case indeed.⁹

When, in addition to the above, thirteen per cent of these same future promoters of American Foreign Policy could not find the Atlantic Ocean,¹⁰ then Papal sneers are not altogether unjustified. Indeed, Papal assertions that a democracy is composed of individuals who are the natural members of the universal party of the “Know Nothings”—a party, incidentally, which actually flourished in the U.S.A.¹¹—and hence that it is most unwise to invest authority “in the multitudes,” have more than a good deal of justification.

Neither is this all. In addition to such colossal ignorance, the American people seem to be even less qualified to run a democracy when drug addiction among them within a few years increased at the appalling rate of more than 600 per cent;¹² and when an estimated 6,000,000 American voters are either partly or totally qualified alcoholics;¹³ when 8,000,000

Americans are partially or totally mentally clinically diseased; and, last but not least, when another 7,000,000 (i.e. one in every twenty Americans) are officially counted as "criminals," with the result that—and these are the official figures of the American Federal Bureau of Investigation—"a murder, rape, or robbery is committed every eighteen seconds in the U.S., day and night, throughout the year,"¹⁴ the Papal indictment that a people cannot and should not be permitted to be its own ruler could not be more justified.

Yet no true lover of liberty, even when confronted by such dismal figures, would be induced to denounce, condemn, suppress, or abolish democracy and the principles inspired by it. The imperfections of democracy, although mostly caused by the people, in due course can and will be lessened, indeed made to vanish, by the amelioration of the intellectual, economic, and political structures of the society upon which popular government is erected.

To admit the partial inability of the people to rule itself, to recognize its shortcomings and the near-failure of modern democracy to stand by its own principles, is neither to condemn nor to deny the right to authority or the delegated power of the masses. It is to recognize faults which it is the duty of every able citizen to remedy, to make popular governments more fit to govern.

Catholic condemnation of democracy, however, is not inspired by such considerations. It springs from ineradicable Catholic hostility to freedom in any form and, above all, from the Catholic determination to rule with a rod of iron.

Catholic odium against modern democracy is nothing new. It is rooted in the most ancient past. Catholicism has hated, opposed, and attempted to destroy democracy from its very inception in its ruthless efforts to hamper the march of the masses towards freedom.

The most venerable original source of modern democracy in the West was the Magna Carta. With that document, and for the first time, certain basic principles of individual freedom were set forth. These, although very inadequate to our modern eyes, were later to become the stem from which almost all democratic principles accepted by the West were eventually to blossom. The Catholic Church not only denounced this

document, but, after having described the inspirers of the Charter as being "worse than Saracens," it solemnly condemned it and forbade all Christians to accept the principles it embodied. It was thus that, upon the Magna Carta, the great charter of modern liberties, Pope Innocent III, after having called it "a diabolical document," pronounced the following:

In the name of God Almighty, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and by authority of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, after having taken counsel with our brothers, we wholly reject and condemn this charter.¹⁵

The Popes equally rejected and condemned the principles of the French Revolution.

Their condemnations were not merely theoretical. People found supporting them were made to suffer severe penalties. In the Western Hemisphere, following the North American Revolution, South Americans carrying medallions inscribed with the words "American Liberty" were penalized. The Government of Madrid, on the Vatican's advice, issued a royal decree making it a crime to possess them. Anyone caught supporting the principles which set the United States free was officially accused of "heretical ideas." The Holy Inquisition, as the most effective instrument of the Catholic Church, was put to work in an attempt to stamp out the diabolical doctrines of North American democracy. In Brazil the Constitution of the U.S.A. was put on the prohibited-reading list. In 1788 Olavide, in Peru, was found guilty of "heretical beliefs" and condemned to perform an ignominious public penance, by the Inquisition, for having in his private library the writings of Voltaire, Rousseau, Bayle, and North American liberals. In Colombia, in 1794, Antonio Narino, having come across a copy of the forbidden *Declaration of the Rights of Man*, had it translated into Spanish. For such crime his goods were confiscated, his family proscribed, and he himself condemned to ten years' imprisonment in Africa.

When, in spite of the Catholic Church's opposition, the Spanish Colonies became independent, Spain and her reactionary allies, backed by the Holy Alliance, organized an expeditionary force, with a view to reconquering Latin America and stamping out the "pestilential ideas of the North

American and French Revolutions.” The Pope bolstered their anti-liberal crusade by issuing a special encyclical in which he opposed, damned, and condemned American emancipation.

The Catholic Church opposed the abolition of slavery—e.g. in Brazil, where, during the Latin-American revolutions, there existed the largest slave class in the whole of America, over one-half of the 7,000,000 inhabitants being slaves, a good portion of them owned by the Church. When the Brazilian Parliament in the last century abolished slavery the Church denounced the promoters of the Bill with the bitterest venom—indeed, she went so far as to help in the downfall of the Emperor of Brazil on the ground that he was one of its main advocates.

The Catholic Church has not only persistently opposed the abolition of slavery, but sanctioned slavery. A Papal Bull in 1537 sanctioned the opening of slave markets in Lisbon, where between 10,000 and 12,000 negroes were sold each year, for transportation to the American colonies. The Popes approved slavery in Portugal as late as 1837.

No Pope issued encyclicals condemning slavery until 1871, when slavery had been abolished practically throughout the civilized nations; even less did they promote mighty crusades to free slaves and thus abolish one of the most un-Christian institutions of Christendom, as they did against the American colonies, against the liberals of the nineteenth century, and against the Communists of the twentieth.

On the contrary, the abolition of slavery was initiated by Protestants, liberals, and democrats. It never came from the Vatican, which opposed it with the utmost stubbornness—e.g. when the various governments of Europe attempted to sign an international agreement among themselves to render slavery illegal.

Perhaps the most illuminating example occurred when, after the downfall of Napoleon, the European Nations convened in Vienna to plan a new Europe. The new Europe, it should be noted, was to be rebuilt as much as possible on the pre-Napoleonic Europe of the previous century. Results: the old kingly tyrants returned *en masse* to their golden thrones, and the most reactionary regimes were promptly installed in practically the whole of the European continent. Notwithstand-

ing this, most of these super-conservative rulers decided to do away with one of the blackest spots of European civilization: slavery. The proposals, at the Congress of Vienna, did not come from any Catholic powers, or even less from the Vatican, which had sent a Papal representative. They came from Protestant England.

Pope Pius VII had sent to the Congress Cardinal Consalvi, who was there in 1814 and in 1815. Cardinal Consalvi was one of the most liberal-minded cardinals of the period. When, therefore, the English proposals for the abolition of slavery were put forward, Consalvi should, at least, have sympathized with the attempt. Instead, what happened? He was genuinely surprised that anyone should even think of abolishing slavery. He poured scorn upon the whole issue. The Cardinal was in the habit of sending regular secret dispatches to the Pope. In one of these he tells His Holiness about the British plan and about his encounter with Lord Castlereagh, who first approached him on the question :

He [Lord Castlereagh] went so far as to tell me that England desired the co-operation of the Holy Father in an affair that he had much at heart and about which he spoke with an earnestness that your Eminence could scarcely imagine. And what was it all about? Your Eminence will be as surprised as I was when I learned that he had in mind to speak about the suppression of the Negro slave trade.

Thereupon the Cardinal, after having described his merriment at such a fantastic idea, came down to the practical side of the matter :

I had to bear in mind that a too curt response would not have been pleasing [the Cardinal continued], in view of the tremendous interest that the English Government takes in this affair, as is proved by the text itself of Lord Castlereagh's note. I got a clear idea of the necessity of adding something which would satisfy the English Government without, however, *compromising us*. Other reflections presented themselves to my mind which seemed to me very serious, such as the fact that in order to recognize a certain usage as contrary to humanity and charity the head of our religion should have had to undergo pressure from a non-Catholic power, and that the Holy See has remained so long silent on a subject of such serious interest.

The Cardinal, after having thus admitted pressure from a non-Catholic power to suppress slavery, and that the Catholic

Church had "remained so long silent," made a further no less revealing admission—namely, that certain nations where the Catholic Church ruled supreme were against the abolition of slavery, and that the Catholic Church did not want to go against their financial interests. Here are the Cardinal's concluding words:

I reflected also on the fact that we might offend the Catholic powers which hold to the preservation of this usage [slavery], which is very useful to their pecuniary interests.

The Cardinal could also have added, "which was very useful to the Popes only a few years ago." For, incredible as it may sound, little more than 150 years ago, the Vicars of Jesus Christ on Earth were buying and selling slaves on their own. Although not greatly publicized either by the Propaganda Fide or by the American hierarchy, the un-Christian but real fact is that Pope Pius VI was selling slaves as recently as the last century. A list of the slaves sold by His Holiness, complete with their names and a description of their clothes and ages, can be perused, with much edification, by anyone who cares to look at the document. For those who can believe in revolving suns, but not in authentic documentation, perhaps the following declarations attached to the Papal list might be of interest:

I, the undersigned, declare that I have received from the Illustrious Signori the brothers Manzi, Assentisti Generali of the Pontifical Naval Supplies, the above-mentioned twenty-four slaves, clad in all their clothing, consigned to me by the orders of His Excellency the Very Reverend Monsignor Fabrizio Ruffo, Treasurer and Commissario Generale of the Sea, given on the 8th of this month for the first seventeen; and on the 20th, for the remaining seven: and these have been received on account of Signore Domenico Lavaggi of Rome, whose duty it is to deposit the total amount in the Treasury of the Reverend Camera: that is, for the first [consignment] 30 scudi each, and for the second, 40 scudi each, as agreed with His previously-praised Excellency. In fede, etc., Nicolò Parodi, Civitavecchia, 23rd November, 1788.¹⁶

The Popes not only never fought against slavery, not only accepted it as part and parcel of Christian society, but actually encouraged Catholic nations to capture and sell Christians in the free slave-markets of Europe. One particular Pope duly proclaimed the right of either sex, *clerical or lay*, to own

slaves: indeed, this same Pope planned nothing less than to have English men and women captured and sold as slaves throughout the West. The Holy Father's name? Pope Paul III.

Paul III, in fact, condemned everyone in England or elsewhere who supported Henry VIII *to be sold as a slave*. The Holy Father was the happy owner of many himself. His successors were no less practising Christians than Paul III. As already mentioned, in 1789 the Pope owned fifty slaves, which number was subsequently increased to several hundred in the following years.

By whom was slavery abolished in the Papal States and in Rome where the Popes were kings? By some newly elected Pontiff endowed with an extraordinary memory which, on his elevation, enabled him suddenly to remember with a certain degree of accuracy the message of the four Gospels? Oh, most historical impossibility! No!

The Holy Fathers were given a most concrete lesson in Christianity by a most unholy son, who probably had never cared to open the pages of either Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John, but who knew Papal history well. This most unholy spiritual offspring, towards the dawning of the last century, acting in a most un-Catholic manner, simply robbed His Holiness the Pope of his legal property by snatching away several hundred slaves and sending them back to Africa, *free*. The robbery meant the end of slavery in the seat of Catholic morality. The name of this most amoral evildoer? Napoleon Bonaparte.

Once more, what forced men to break the chains of bondage was inspired neither by the Catholic Church nor by the Popes, but by the principles of the French and American revolutions, against which the Pontiffs were at that very period hurling all their anathemas.

But, if it is fair to indict the Popes for trafficking in slavery, it is also fair to remember that the "heretical" English were doing the same and were no less piously trafficking with their fellow-Christians than were the Catholics. Some Protestants went so far as to see that other Protestants with whom they disagreed on religious dogma be captured and sold as slaves, "so that the Lord may be glorified." This manner of preventing the Lord from being "mocked" is even more striking

when it is pointed out that some of these unworthy exertions were directed against certain Christians who ever since have given the most praiseworthy example of genuine practical Christianity to both Protestants and Catholics—i.e. the Quakers.

Here is the text of as unedifying a document as can be found in any of the Papal records :

September ye 15, 1682,

To ye Aged and Beloved Mr. JOHN HIGGINSON,

There is now at sea a ship called the *Welcome*, which has on board an hundred or more of the heretics and malignants called "Quakers," with W. Penn, who is the chief scamp, at the head of them.

The general court has accordingly given secret orders to Master Malachi Huscott, of the brig *Porpoise*, to waylay the said Penn and his ungodly crew, so that the Lord may be glorified, and not mocked on the soil of this new country with the heathen worship of these people.

Much spoil can be made by selling the whole lot to Barbados, where slaves fetch good prices in rum and sugar.

COTTON MATHER,

American clergyman

(1663-1728).

Protestant nations were no less eager than Protestant individuals about holding on to the preservation of this "usage." The English were selling and buying slaves and, indeed, preying upon ships "at sea" one century and a half after Cotton Mather's advice to Mr. J. Higginson.

After due credit is given to the courage and idealism of many individuals who genuinely fought against the retention of slavery, preservation of the "usage," as the Cardinal put it, not only was advocated by most of them; many had become the happy promoters of a roaring slave trade.

The British Government was no less busy in this "free enterprise." For, while its official representative at the Congress of Vienna, Lord Castlereagh, was vainly trying to persuade the Catholic Church to side with him to make Christian Europe slightly more Christian, the British mercantile marine was raiding ships filled with liberated slaves, sailing from the United States to Liberia, Africa.

Here again, it is not any Catholic country, or, even less, the Vatican, who gave a helping hand to the slaves, but another Protestant nation, acting, not on religious principles but on

humanitarian grounds—indeed, inspired by the very tenets based on what the Catholic Church called the “diabolical” doctrines of the American Constitution. The movement for the liberation of negro slaves was begun by the American Colonization Society in 1816, followed by the Maryland Colonization Society, and others. In 1821 the most important of such organizations got a title to land from the aborigines on the West Coast of Africa. In 1822 the *Mayflower* unloaded its first freed slaves on the shore of what is now Liberia. These, the freed slaves, founded their new capital, Monrovia, named after President Monroe. The British set out to capture those who followed, and whenever the newly liberated American slaves fell into their hands, then their freedom was lost for good and they were ruthlessly dumped in Sierra Leone by British-manned ships, where they started a new life of slavery.

In 1847 Liberia was set up as an independent republic, upon a Constitution patterned on that of the U.S.A. Most European nations promptly recognized the new nation, with notable exceptions—most of the Catholic governments, and, ironically enough, that of the U.S.A., which did not grant recognition until fifteen years later, i.e. not until 1862, when the Civil War removed Southern opposition.

During the American Civil War the Vatican openly sided with the Southern States, wanting to retain slavery, and waging a most insidious war against Lincoln, as we shall presently see. On this occasion the Vatican not only sided with the Southern States which wanted to retain slavery, but openly rejoiced that American democracy was in danger of being destroyed by the Civil War, going so far—when Lincoln’s cause seemed to be on the brink of defeat—as to declare that “by a manifest Providence, that immense Babylon (the U.S.A.), founded on the principles of the revolution, is broken and undone.”¹⁷

The hatred which the Catholic Church bears against any progressive movement has never abated. Although, since the total abolition of slavery, it took different forms, owing mainly to the progress made by Liberalism and democracy, the Catholic Church, whenever she had enough power, has always attempted to thwart, hamper, and slow down progressive

principles and practices, not refraining, on more than one occasion, from resorting openly to murder. The most striking relatively recent example occurred during the last century in Italy, when Freemasons, liberals, and democrats (the equivalent of the Communists of the following century) were pursued and often killed at street corners or in public meetings, with the connivance of the authorities, by bands of fanatical members of the Church who belonged to a Catholic organization, inspired and promoted by the Vatican, called the Sanfedisti, the name being a contraction of Santa Fe, Holy Faith.

The Popes continued to oppose both Liberalism and democracy to such an extent that Pius IX issued his famous *Syllabus*, the greatest accumulation of malediction against modern democracy and all that it stands for in the history of the West. Later, in their undiminished hatred, they ordered all Italian Catholics to oppose and boycott the Italian Government, by strictly forbidding them, under pain of eternal damnation, to vote or to stand as candidates for the Government. *Ne eletti, ne' elettori* (no elected, no electors) became the rallying cry of the Catholic Church, a slogan which made a great hit with the conservative Europe of the period. In 1867 the Vatican made this the official rule of all Catholics, by issuing its *Non Expedit* (it is not expedient). In 1895 it strengthened this by telling Catholics that *Non Expedit* meant that it was specifically prohibited to support any liberal or democratic government. This, it must be noted, was officially removed only after the First World War, when the Vatican sympathized with, blessed, and supported Fascism in Italy, Hitler in Germany, Salazar in Portugal, Primo De Rivera and Franco in Spain, and all the dictators in Latin America, not to mention the Fascist dictators in Poland, Hungary, and other Eastern European countries.

Catholic hostility towards democracy has not abated. It is still there, alive, potent, and as scheming as ever. The successors of Pius IX and of Leo XIII, that most "progressive" of modern Popes, have not changed. On the contrary, they have hurled more authoritative odium against it. Pius XI, the man "who was no lover of Democracy," dissolved several Catholic parties inspired by democratic principles, with the definite purpose of paving the way for Fascism and Nazism.

Pius XII—whom *Ecclesia*, the official organ of the Spanish Central Board of Catholic Action, in an attempt to pay him the greatest tribute a Catholic paper could pay, called “His Holiness Pius XII, the best anti-democrat in the World”¹⁸—is one of the most deadly enemies of democracy in the twentieth century. The insidiousness of his diplomatic and political cunning, as well as of his sly use of a pseudo-democratic phraseology, have proved disastrous, even among the rank and file of the democracies themselves, who finally sided with the Catholic Church in her anti-Communist crusade. Pius XII promoted pseudo-democratic political Catholic parties throughout Europe after the Second World War. Most of these, called Christian Democrats, were neither democratic nor Christian nor merely political parties, but purely political tools used by the Catholic Church as the most up-to-date instruments with which to undermine and ultimately to destroy genuine democracy throughout the West.

Pius XII’s declarations against democracy, like his deeds, were innumerable. “Today, everywhere, the life of nations is disintegrated by the blind worship of numerical strength,” he said on one occasion. “The citizen is a voter. But, as such, he is in reality none other than one of the units whose total constitutes a majority or a minority, which a shifting of some votes, even of only one, is sufficient to overturn,” he stated on another, implying that democracy was insufficient, absurd, and wrong. Modern society must be free from “the cogs of a mechanical unitarianism,” he said once. Indeed, society, according to Pius XII, was being disrupted by democracy, that “blind cult of the value of numbers.”¹⁹

The attitude of the Catholic Church towards economic, social, and political progress, inspired by the liberal and the democratic principles upon which contemporary democracies the world over are erected, was put into a nutshell by one of his predecessors :

Let him be anathema who affirms that the Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile and adapt himself to PROGRESS, to Liberalism and to modern culture.²⁰

This ringing malediction is as valid now as when it was first uttered by the cursing Papal lips.

CATHOLIC OPPOSITION TO FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE, OF SPEECH, AND OF THE PRESS

“**W**HEN WE CATHOLICS ARE IN A minority, we demand freedom in the name of *your* principles; when we Catholics are in the majority, we deny freedom in the name of *our* principles.”¹

And hard, concrete deeds have made of this the most characteristic Catholic formula of modern times. Particularly in non-Catholic countries, where Catholicism’s ceaseless exertions directed at undermining democratic liberties are invariably orientated by the ruthless opportunism epitomized by such villainous cynicism.

Catholic energy is perennially directed against freedom—that is to say, against freedom not approved by the Catholic Church, which, therefore, must be combated as error.

One of such most pernicious errors: religious freedom.

Religious freedom as an error, however, cannot by any means remain isolated. Being an intrinsic facet of the general freedom which stands at the very base of the democratic fabric, it is an integral part of other, no less pernicious liberties, which must also be either partially restricted or, at times, even

totally suppressed. In virtue of this, the Catholic Church, being consistent, asserts that the State should not only forbid any other religion to be set on an equal footing with her, but also prohibit the mischievous doctrine of indiscriminate individual liberty. For, as Pope Pius XII sternly reminded Catholics, "individual liberty in reality is only a deadly anarchy."² Liberty of the individual to say or to read what he likes, for instance, is an error. Hence Catholic condemnation of freedom of speech and of the Press. This, on the ground that, if a man is free to speak and print what he likes, he can harm the truth. Truth only has absolute rights. Deceptive and lying opinions, consequently, should be diligently suppressed by the State. As "truth alone should fill the minds of men,"³ and as the Catholic Church is "the greatest and most reliable teacher of mankind," it follows that it is up to her to say which are the liberties which men should enjoy, for "in her dwells an inviolable right to teach them."³

This must not be resented, says the Church, for "there is no reason why genuine liberty should grow indignant . . . at having to bear the just and necessary restraint of laws by which, in the judgment of the Church and of reason itself, human teaching has to be controlled."³

The necessary restraint to teaching is not applicable only to the schools; it covers the unofficial education of adult citizens by means of Press, books, films, broadcasts, television—i.e. censorship.

Censorship is necessary, declare the Popes, because liberty to think is "*contrary to reason.*" And, furthermore, because "the unrestrained freedom of thinking and of openly making known one's thoughts is not inherent in the rights of citizens."⁴

Owing to this, they have decreed that it is "quite unlawful to demand, defend, or grant unconditional freedom of thought, speech, writing, or worship as if these were so many rights given by nature to man." For "it always remains true that the liberty which is claimed for all to do all things is not, as we have often said, of itself desirable, as such, as it is contrary to reason that error and truth should have equal rights."⁵

Modern man, consequently, should reject unconditional freedom to think, say, or read what he likes. For, by so doing, he would court ruin. Proofs? "The experience of

every age teaches, and even remotest antiquity clearly demonstrates," assert the Popes, "that the cities which most flourished in opulence, and glory, came to ruin from this cause only: that is, from immoderate liberty of thought, licence of meeting, and the mania of novelty." ⁶

One of the worst liberties of modern society is that permitting the people to read what they like. That is something which every good Catholic must genuinely execrate. Whenever reminded of the liberty of the modern Press, the Popes are always tempted to lose their pontifical patience. "Similar to liberty of worship is that worst of liberties, never sufficiently execrated or abhorred, *liberty of the Press*," said Leo XIII. This does not mean that other liberties can be tolerated. Perish the thought. Like religious freedom and freedom of the Press, they must equally be curtailed and even wholly abolished, because "*all liberty is a delirium and a pestilence*," asserted another no less "progressive" Pope. "There is no healthy man's delirium," commented His Holiness, "all delirium is that of a sick man. There is no praiseworthy and harmless plague; every plague is deadly. . . . Hence it is never a decent thing to introduce liberty into a civil community. It is only permissible to tolerate it in certain cases, in the same way that a pest is tolerated." ⁶

These are Papal dicta. Catholic contentions—aired particularly in Protestant countries—that, because the Popes did not condemn liberty *ex cathedra*, they are not forced to accept the Papal condemnation of freedom, are false. Leo XIII rudely slammed the door on such reasoning. Catholics must accept whatever the Popes decree as teaching which they must obey:

In defining the limits of the obedience owed . . . to the authority of the Roman Pontiff [he said in his encyclical *Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens*], it *must not* be supposed that it is only to be yielded in relation to dogma . . . [Catholics must] allow themselves to be ruled and directed by the authority and leadership of bishops and, above all, of the Apostolic See. [Indeed], as regards opinion, whatever the Roman Pontiffs have hitherto taught, or shall hereafter teach, must be held with a firm grasp of mind, and, so often as occasion requires, must be openly professed.

Catholics are not the professed enemies of liberty merely in theory. They are so also in practice. They think, behave, and

act as such. Their exertions, of course, are made to conform to the religious-political climate of the society in which they live. These exertions can comprise all the gradations of shade, from an open, blatant condemnation to a subtle, insidious enmity, according to whether their Church is powerful or weak, the predominant or the smallest religious organization of a city or of a nation.

In a wholly Catholic country, where Church and State are one, for instance, freedom is extinct. There is only one religion: Catholicism. Only one party: that in power. As the former is the inspirer of the latter, and as the latter is the supporter of the former, the totalitarianism of both is integrated, and any freedom not in conformity with Catholic doctrines is condemned. The thwarting of freedom can range from the banning of non-Catholic denominations and the condemnation of liberalism to dictates about swimming-suits—e.g. compelling men to cover their chests and wear trunks reaching almost to their knees; and women to cover their backs and wear skirts, and turn to the sea while sun-bathing; or closing art exhibitions on the sound pretext that “crowds do not possess the artistic capacity to appreciate the total beauty of the human body.” These decrees were issued in Spain in June, 1951. Similar legislation was enacted in Italy in 1948, and in France under the Petain regime.⁷ In 1952 Cardinal Guevara, of Lima, Peru, issued a decree prohibiting the playing of Mendelssohn’s wedding march, women singing solos, mixed choirs, and the taking of all posed wedding photographs.⁸

In a wholly Catholic country where Catholicism is all-powerful but where the democratic machinery is partially working, freedom can be paralysed in matters dealing with criticism of the Church’s religious, ethical, moral, and social ideas, and in the approbation and propagation of Protestantism. In such a country the restriction of civil freedom will take the form of a strict domestic censorship and the banning of books, newspapers, films—e.g. Catholic Ireland.

In a country where democratic forces are very powerful but where a Catholic party is the dominant political party and, by ruling the government single-handed, exerts a kind of mild authoritarianism, freedom, although superficially unhampered, is yet being unobtrusively but steadily stultified—e.g. Italy,

under the Catholic Christian Democratic Party after the Second World War. Thus, while non-Catholic members of Parliament could be deprived of their Parliamentary immunity and brought to court for offending the Pope,⁹ and journalists or plain citizens could be sentenced for criticizing the political activities of the Vatican,¹⁰ people were forbidden to kiss in public because of clerical disapproval,¹¹ feminine fashions were banned upon the frowning of the Church,¹² sartorial innovations were charged with immorality, and aluminium fig-leaves were bolted on to marble statues, as was done to the sixty statues of nude athletes at the Foro Italico, Rome, in December, 1950.

In a democratic country where the Church, although not in power, nevertheless can exercise great influence upon the government through public opinion, freedom is attacked by devious means—e.g. by the publication in the daily papers of a list of the films which the Catholic Church unofficially orders Catholics to boycott, as in Belgium.¹³

In a Protestant country freedom is attacked in a more subtle way. For instance, via the Catholic Press, or, more frequently, via the channels of the ordinary Press, where, more often than not, Catholic influence is indirectly but concretely exercised. Here freedom, although at times openly attacked, as a rule is hampered by dubious devices, such as consistently ignoring certain news, the use of silence blankets, the skilful distortion of coverage of small and big events, the indirect boycott of books, films, and the like—e.g. in England.

In a country in which, although Protestant, yet the Catholic Church is represented by a substantial and vociferous minority, the attack against freedom is carried out with a cautious boldness, ranging from open attack under the specious plea of public morality, or war against political movements, to direct or indirect boycott, organized pressure groups, or the "imponderable" menace of undetectable blackmail, with which to "correct or direct" individuals, organizations, local administration, and even the Federal Government, for instance, in the U.S.A. Here Catholic censorship is exercised through such "democratic" instruments as the Legion of Decency, blacklisting, purging, purifying and directing films, television, and broadcasting; the Knights of Columbus,

restraining, coaching and advising public bodies, politicians, and administrations; the Catholic Daughters of America, defending the sacredness of marriage and "combating divorce"; the National Federation of Catholic College students, "cleaning up news-stands" in crusades to stamp out indecent and anti-Catholic literature; the Holy Name Society, "preventing the sale of comic books harmful to children"; and countless similar organizations. Thanks to these, influential non-Catholic bodies, from movie-makers to booksellers and politicians, seldom dare openly to defy Catholic ire, in fear of the Catholic "white terror" so ominously exercised upon a preponderantly Protestant nation.

The Catholic Church can hamper freedom also in non-Christian lands by either seeking the support of powerful lay interests determined to fight the same ideological enemies or relying on the authorities of foreign Powers controlling the non-Christian populations—e.g. in Japan, occupied by the Americans (1945-51), Indo-China under the French. Independent or semi-independent countries can be included in such a category—e.g. Egypt, Morocco, Nigeria.

Catholic stultification of the concept and practice of freedom can operate on an international scale, either by influencing bodies such as the world-wide Federation of Catholic Universities, St. Joan's International Social and Political Alliance, the International Union of Catholic Women, and similar organizations, or by the threat of a Catholic "white terror" upon others, such as the International Court of Justice at the Hague¹⁴ or the United Nations Organization itself, as we shall presently see.

Owing to the Catholic capacity to operate in regional, national, and international fields, therefore, the Catholic Church is a true menace to the democratic freedom of individuals and nations throughout the world, to be constantly combated, lest she be permitted to reach her ultimate goal and thus exert the inevitable tyranny inherent both in her principles and in her practices.

The Catholic Church, while obdurate, is nonetheless realistic. And when operating in Protestant countries,

although intransigent with her principles, she can modify her tactics and, indeed, chameleon-like, adapt herself to the society within which she is functioning, the better to weaken her opponents.

With regard to her attitude towards liberty, religious tolerance, and the like, being faced with the fact that the majority of States will never follow her precepts and that millions of her members are citizens of such States, she has enlarged upon her principles in such a manner as to endow their practice with the greatest elasticity, with the set purpose of avoiding making of Catholic citizens the open enemies of the State.

Thus, while telling Catholics that the separation of Church and State "is of a nature which no one can approve,"¹⁵ simultaneously she advises them to compromise. When freedom of worship is granted to all religions, they had better not oppose it, to "avoid greater evil." For, says the Pope, "while she [the Church] deems it unlawful to place various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion [Catholicism], she does not on that account condemn those rulers who, for the sake of securing some great good or of hindering some great evil, tolerate in practice that these various forms of religion have a place in the State."¹⁵

Freedom for the "various forms of divine worship," however, should go thus far and no farther, warns the Church. For, if it were to enable citizens to harm the "true religion," then it must be withdrawn.¹⁶ Hence "freedom in these things may be tolerated whenever there is a just cause,"¹⁷ but should be tolerated "only with such moderation as will prevent its degenerating into licence and excess."¹⁷

Catholic freedom, however, is not the freedom as acknowledged by the modern State, because "genuine liberty," declares the Church, is that freedom which "does not allow the individual to become the slave of error and passion,"¹⁸ as a State based on democracy does.

Consequently, Catholics must not fall into the fallacy that, because they have to tolerate a democracy, they must cease to fight it. The granting of civic liberties must not allure them to such an erroneous conclusion. "Let no one be deceived by those outward appearances of these liberties," the Popes tell them, and "let them consider all the deplorable consequences

that these liberties with which the modern State has endowed them as citizens have brought in their trail . . . fruits which good and wise men must deplore.”¹⁹

Catholics have duties towards the State, but, as members of the Church they have duties which are more sacred than their civil ones, declare the Popes. Therefore, they must “endeavour to bring back all civil society to Catholicism.”²⁰ This can be done by making “use of popular institutions.” Catholics, however, must take care to set limits to their collaboration with the popular institution of a democratic State, “lest they help the latter to go against the principles of religion,” or to sponsor false opinions. Consequently, “care must be taken never to connive in any way at false opinions, nor ever to withstand them less strenuously than truth allows.”²⁰

This superficial Catholic tolerance of democracy, “to avoid greater evil,” is stretched farther. And, in her attempt to allow Catholics to penetrate democratic structures without imperilling their chance of so doing by a strict observance of their opposition to democratic theory and practice, the Catholic Church has resorted to one of the most perverted pieces of sophistry ever invented by organized religion.

This is what Catholic theology labels *restrictio mentalis*—i.e. mental reservation—but what any honest individual must label typical Catholic hypocrisy.

Mental reservation has been invented to enable Catholics to pretend they can be loyal citizens of any State, whether democratic or totalitarian, without bothering their consciences, by betraying themselves and the State, in order to be loyal to the Catholic Church.

Mental reservation falls into two categories: (a) equivocation, and (b) mental reservation proper. The greatest authority in this field is Saint Alphonsus Liguori, who was canonized in 1835. His *Moral Theology* is the recognized text-book on all questions of conscience. Other books on the subject, such as those of Gury, Dens, Stradler, and others, including contemporary American Catholic theological writers, are little more than extracts from his work.

St. Alphonsus, quoted and requoted by the Popes, teaches Catholics how to avoid, when necessary, giving allegiance to

the State while pretending to do so; and, while fulfilling their duty as citizens, remain the faithful members of the Church, and thus not betray the obedience they owe to her to fight the State. This can be done with "equivocation." "To swear with equivocation when there is a just cause is not evil," declares the Father of Catholic Morality, "because where there is just cause for concealing the truth and it is concealed without a lie, no detriment is done to the oath . . . in the clear understanding of what is said here . . . many distinctions are necessary. In the first place we are to distinguish that one is 'double speaking' or *equivocation*, and the other *mental reservation*. Double speaking can be used in a threefold manner :

- "(1) When words have a double sense; for instance, *volo* signifies to wish, and also to fly.
- "(2) When an expression has a double meaning; e.g. *This is Peter's* book can signify that Peter is either the owner of the book or the author of the book.
- "(3) When words have a double meaning, one more common and the other less common.

"These things being established, it is certain and a common opinion amongst all divines that for a just cause it is lawful to use equivocation in the propounded modes, and to confirm it [equivocation] with an oath."

Catholics, therefore, can safely cheat a democracy or any civil authority, a dictatorship or, indeed, anyone, provided they do it for a "just cause."

A typical instance of this occurred in August, 1931, when a royal decree forced all professors at Italian universities to sign an oath in which they had to swear to "educate active and valiant citizens devoted to the country and to the Fascist Regime."

Many professors, some of whom were practising Catholics, were put before a tragic dilemma. Either they took the oath, forfeiting their self-respect and consciences, or they were dismissed. The Catholic professors appealed to the Vatican. They did not wish to take the oath "to the Fascist Regime." On the other hand, they could not afford to lose their jobs. What was the Church's advice?

The Church advised "equivocation." On December 4, 1931, the *Osservatore Romano* came out with an editorial, inspired by Pius XI. In it the professors were told that in the formula of the oath the words "Fascist Regime" meant, not the Fascist Regime, but the Government of the State—a State which could also be non-Fascist. The same article pretended also not to understand that the formula pledged those who took the oath to teach Fascist doctrines in all Italian universities. The Vatican's conclusion: the professors should take the oath.

When a Catholic must take an oath of allegiance—e.g. to the Constitution—or must swear to observe loyally the laws of the State, and equivocation is not possible, then, provided he puts Catholic tenets first, he can lie, with the blessing of the Church.

Thomas Sanchez, another luminary of Catholic theology, dealing with *restrictio mentalis*, says this:

If anyone, by himself, or before others, where under examination of his own accord, whether for annulment or for any other purpose, should swear that he has not done something which he had really done, having in mind something else, which he has not done, or some way of doing it other than the way he employed, or anything else that is true, he does not lie nor perjure himself.²¹

This magic formula of mental reservation is strengthened by St. Liguori:

... although it is not lawful to lie, or to deign what is not; however it is lawful to dissemble what is, or to cover the truth with words, or other ambiguous and doubtful sign, for a just cause, and when there is not a necessity of confessing.

It would be the greatest mistake to believe that this is mere theory. Catholics throughout the world practise it daily. It can serve the Church equally well in her dealings with or against democracies or totalitarianisms, Protestant, Catholic, or even non-Christian States.

In the U.S.A., for instance, American Catholics are briefed by theologians on this tenet before taking any official oath in which they have to swear to be true to the American Constitution. To be sure, this is not preached from the pulpits, nor is it required from the rank and file of the American Church.

It is required only from Catholics attaining eminent legal, juridical, executive, political, or army positions. To these individuals there are frequently attached theologians, usually Jesuits, to make sure that, while acting as Catholics *first* and citizens of the U.S. *second*, they remain enthusiastic supporters of the "American way of life" at all times—e.g. Senator Pat McCarran and Senator J. McCarthy—the two most unscrupulous champions of the technique of the *Big Lie* and of "character-assassination" in the U.S.A.

In the U.S.A., England, Holland, France—that is to say, in Protestant, half-Protestant, and nominally Catholic countries with democratic governments—the "magic formula" of *restrictio mentalis* is made to work undetected, comparatively sporadically, and in a rather limited fashion.

At times, however, it can be promoted on a large scale, openly and directly, by the local hierarchy, or even by the Vatican itself, (a) to support a Fascist dictatorship; (b) to oppose Communist regimes; (c) to appease a friendly nation; (d) to cheat the State by the promotion of tax evasion; (e) to deceive other Christian Churches; and (f) to promote Catholic economic-social systems contrary to democracy.

One of the most significant examples occurred with a Fascist dictatorship, again in Italy, in connexion with the Fascist oath of allegiance to Mussolini, obligatory for all who applied for membership to the Fascist Party.

A good minority of Italian Catholics, who, by the way, had their party dissolved by direct orders from the Vatican (1926) and who were then advised by the Italian hierarchy to join the Fascist Party, appealed to the Pope about the implications of the oath. What were they to do? Did not the oath force them to put the Leader of Fascism before the Leader of the Church? And, if so, was not that a sin?

Pope Pius XI, as in the case of the professors, solved the problem with the grand Catholic formula of "mental reservation." Catholics could cheat the devil by taking the oath "before God and their conscience," by adding to it the SILENT reservation "excepting the laws of God and His Church," the Pope told them. Many did, and the Fascist Party gained thousands of new members.

This was not the only case. Catholics were told by the

Germany hierarchy to vote for Hitler in the Rhineland elections in 1936, by using the same formula.²²

In Japan, during the Second World War, when the Government made it compulsory to pay homage to the Emperor, thus forcing Japanese Catholics to perform a pagan act of worship, the Church, which at first had refused to bow to such a law, finally advised her Japanese members (an important political agreement having meanwhile been reached between the Japanese militarists and the Vatican, as we shall presently see) to obey the new Imperial decree. How was this to be done? By using the magic formula of "mental reservation."

After the Second World War the magic formula was used to deceive the Communist governments of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania, and Catholics were duly counselled to take any oath necessary, provided they remembered the "formula."

The magic formula is not used only for political purposes. It can be employed to cheat the government of any given nation, independently of its political system, provided the Church or her members can profit thereby—e.g. it can be used as an excuse for avoiding payment of taxation.

Perhaps a typical instance can best illustrate this extraordinary Catholic morality :

A priest inquired regarding a certain doctor who was doing much charity work and who had a large family. "Did the doctor do wrong in failing to list his total income, thus escaping some of his taxes? [And] if it is in violation of legal justice, must a doctor make a readjustment of former tax returns?"

"No, it would not be a violation of legal justice," the priest was told, "for those who hold that tax laws are merely penal laws, the solution is simple. In the case we have a doctor who is paying some of his income tax, but not all. Since tax rates are high, moralists teach that a person *who conceals a third or a fourth part of the real value of taxable property is not guilty of injustice*. Even after deducting that amount, he has still fulfilled his obligation to the common good. (Noldin, II, N.316.) . . .

"The answer to the second question is that, even though there is a violation of legal justice, there would be no obligation for the doctor to make a readjustment of his past income. A violation of legal justice does not carry with it the obligation of restitution. What has been written above pertains to the forum of conscience; the civil law takes a very strong stand on tax evasion."²³

That is not all. The same Catholic moral authority, referring to similar cases, was even more explicit :

If an individual alleges money spent for charity that he has not spent, and also expenditure in making money that he hasn't actually made, he seems to be justified in evading taxation by so doing. . . .²⁴

In conclusion, Catholic theologians, by telling Catholics to consider tax laws as "penal laws" and tax rates as excessive, advise the taxpayer that he is not under any obligation to file honest tax returns.

When was such advice given? Prior to the French Revolution, when the whole tax burden had to be carried by the starving French peasantry, while the enormously wealthy aristocracy and even richer Catholic Church and Catholic clergy were wholly exempt from any form of taxation whatsoever? Such advice was given in this our twentieth century. Where? In a Communist country, so that the taxpayer, by financially cheating an Atheistic regime, might contribute to its undermining and thus help in the destruction of the enemy of the Mother Church? Were the reply in the affirmative, many supporters of democracy, headed by certain elements in the U.S.A. and by the Vatican, would call such Catholic principles and practice a "fight for freedom." The majority of honest and straightforward Americans, however, will be somewhat puzzled when told that the Catholic Church gave such advice, not to Catholic taxpayers under the heel of Communist tyrannies, but to American taxpayers under the benevolent administration of democratic U.S.A. For it was, in fact, to the American taxpayers that Catholic theologians counselled such typical Catholic tax-dodging.²⁵

This "mental reservation" or Catholic dishonesty is not made to work only in Catholic countries. It works also in Protestant lands. Indeed, Catholic chicanery in Protestant nations can reach an even higher—or, rather, lower—level in another no less important field: the religious.

Transformed into a mixture of mental reservation, plus equivocation, plus pretence, plus silence, the "magic formula" became one of the permanent solutions of a most embarrassing Catholic tenet. This, it must be noted, not only in connexion with oaths of allegiance affecting the authority of the State,

but in connexion also with certain basic tenets of Catholicism itself. E.g. no non-Catholic can be saved. The Fathers, theologians, and Popes have reiterated this theme *ad nauseam*. Pope Pius IX opened his Pontificate by repeating the doctrine in his first encyclical:

Never at any time tolerate anything which may seem in the least degree to violate the purity of the Faith, and with no less determination promote among all men union with the Catholic Church, *out of which there is no salvation*.

In super-Catholic countries like Franco's Spain, as in any Catholic seminary the world over, this doctrine is so much part and parcel of Catholicism that it is hardly questioned. Yet what happens? When this same doctrine is brought to the fore in Protestant or democratic lands it is hardly mentioned by the Catholics themselves: indeed, their Church has forbidden discussion on the subject. Altogether, the doctrine is taboo.

In the U.S.A. in 1949 four Catholic professors at the Jesuit Boston College publicly charged the President with heresy. Reason? The Boston College's students were taught that "there may be salvation outside the Catholic Church." This, the four professors rightly claimed, was against the most fundamental teaching of Catholicism. The American hierarchy told the four professors to keep silent. The Boston College—or any other college in the U.S.A.—they explained, was teaching what the American Church had judged it useful to teach in the U.S.A. "for the time being." The four professors not only continued in their protests, they appealed directly to the Pope, asking him to remind the American hierarchy that it was their most sacred duty to teach the basic Papal tenet that "outside the Church there is no salvation."

The American hierarchy, in the person of Archbishop Cushing, after having repeatedly reprimanded the zealous professors, dismissed them from the college. When, in spite of this, they continued to voice the basic Catholic doctrine of no salvation outside the Church, they were prohibited from teaching in any Catholic college, until finally they were threatened with excommunication should they further raise

the question to the attention of a wider audience of the American Protestant public.

That was not all. A Jesuit priest, Fr. L. Feeney, noted American author and preacher, was also suspended for "persistently teaching that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church." Indeed, American Catholics were forbidden to attend his lectures or publicly support such a theory under pain of forfeiting the right to receive the sacraments.

The "magic formula," reshaped, disguised, and blanketed in silence, was made to serve American Catholicism, to disguise itself in the apparel of American tolerance, and thus, by avoiding antagonizing the Protestants with an unsavoury Catholic tenet, make it easier for the Church to penetrate their ranks.

The "magic formula" can be made to serve Catholic opportunism, in which art the Church has always been a master. Typical example: Catholic promotion of the Corporate State, a political-economic hybrid incorporating Catholic social-economic teaching.

After the First World War the Corporate State became synonymous with Fascism. Wherever Fascism flourished, there the corporate system was to be found. Fascist Italy, Dolfuss's Austria, Petain's France, were Corporate States; Portugal and Spain, as well as various Latin-American countries, prided themselves on Corporativism. The Corporate State was a creature of the Catholic Church. Its foundation stones: Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum*, and Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno*.

As long as the Fascist fabric stood, the Church supported it. No sooner had Fascism vanished than the Church discarded it. In its place she erected a new political ideology, which she boldly labelled Christian Democracy. Christian Democracy, however, was but a decoy: a tactical move, a bid for time, which had to be accepted, the better to prepare a return of Corporativism. That this was so was proved by the fact that this same Christian Democracy was condemned as soon as it was born. Sangnier, its creator, had not yet begun to preach Christian Democratic ideals, and his famous social-action group, called the *Sillon* (the Furrow), was still a tender infant when the Pope condemned it, its initiator, and his principles. This was before the First World War. As long as Fascism

adopted the corporate doctrines the social teaching of the Church was Corporativism. When the Fascist edifice collapsed Corporativism had to be relegated to the background and the condemned doctrines preached by Sangnier were officially adopted. These were precisely the same ones which the Vatican had banned before the rise of Fascism, the only difference being that, once Fascism vanished, they fitted far better into a democratized post-War Europe than did the too-compromised corporate system. How much better suited they were was proved by the fact that within a few years Catholic Christian Democracy was in power in practically every European country, including Italy, France, and Germany, and had become the dominating ideology of Europe.

Catholic Christian Democracy, however, although clothed in up-to-date democratic dress, stood basically on the same foundations as Corporativism. Most of the sundry budding European extremisms of the Right made no bones about it. In Germany, for instance, Catholic Chancellor Adenauer openly attempted to erect a German Corporate State under the guise of *Economic Councils*.

Here a diluted "magic formula" was directed at promoting Catholic social teaching, with as little antagonism as possible, among democratic nations, particularly Protestant ones.

The "magic formula," in this as in other fields, was purely a temporary and deceptive device of Catholic strategy, directed at undermining the democratic and Protestant fabric of Western society, this being so because Catholic hatred of democracy and Liberalism is as unquenchable as ever. Whenever the opportunity arises the Catholic Church does not hesitate to say so and to act accordingly, without compunction.

A most striking example was that of Fascist Spain, where the Catechism was taught compulsorily in all schools. *A Brief and Simple Explanation of the Catholic Catechism*, distributed in hundreds of thousands, taught undiluted Catholic social and political teaching. Here are a few of its questions and answers:

- Q. What of Communism, Socialism, Modern Democracy, Anarchism, and the like sects?
- A. They are contrary to Catholic faith, to justice, and to all virtue, and as such condemned by the Church.

Q. Do not they say that they want to root out from the world the abuses of the rich and to regenerate Society?

A. They say so; but their doctrines and works prove the contrary.

Q. To what do they pertain?

A. *To Luther and other arch-heretics* who, with the pretence of reforming the Church, teach and practise all kinds of vices. (P. 419.)

Many might approve of this, anything that opposes Communism to them being right. But the Catechism did not teach Spanish youth to reject only Communism, Socialism, Anarchism, and "like sects." It dealt very extensively with Liberalism:

Q. What are liberal principles?

A. Those of 1789: so-called national sovereignty, freedom of religious cults, freedom of the Press, freedom of instruction, universal morality, and other such.

Q. What consequences result from these?

A. Secular schools, impious and immodest periodicals, civil marriage, heretical Churches in Catholic countries, abolition of ecclesiastical immunities . . . , etc.

Q. What does the Church teach about these?

A. That they are most disastrous and anti-Christian.

Q. What more?

A. *That they never can be accepted as good, and may be tolerated only for as long and in so far as they cannot be opposed without creating a worse evil.* (P. 400.)

That was not enough. Questions were asked to the effect whether certain forms of Liberalism could be accepted by Catholics. Lamennais, who loomed prominent in the social and political affairs of French and European Catholicism in the first half of the last century, came out with a formula, which he called "Catholicizing Liberalism," and was promptly condemned. That was when Liberalism was considered as revolutionary as Communism is today. Since then, Catholic antagonism has been profoundly modified, owing to the transformed political habitat. Basically, however, it remains the same. In fact, where the Church is all-powerful,

and therefore has little or nothing to fear, she dares to expound her doctrines in full. The Spanish Catechism could not be more explicit about it:

Q. Then there is no grade of Liberalism that can be good?

A. None; because Liberalism is mortal sin and anti-Christian in essence. (P. 390.)

Q. Then whoever is liberal in politics sins?

A. Certainly: because in liberal politics there exists that Liberalism which the Church condemns.

Q. And if by "Liberal" is understood something not condemned by the Pope?

A. Then he sins in calling himself Liberal, knowing that the Pope condemns Liberalism. . . .

Q. Then a Catholic *must* be anti-Liberal?

A. Without a doubt; exactly as *he must be anti-Protestant* or anti-Freemason; in short, against all the contraries to Christ and his Church. (Pp. 408-9.)

Such teaching was not given only in schools. It was officially preached, in 1951 and 1952, by the Spanish hierarchy, as proved by the instructions issued by the Metropolitan Archbishops of Spain, and signed by the Cardinal of Toledo, in which they condemned Liberalism on the ground that it undermined civil authority by recognizing liberties that were contrary to the common good, because they were contrary to those preached by the Church. In 1951 the Bishop Builes of Santa Rosa, Colombia, South America, issued a pastoral letter on the dangers of Protestantism, recommending "the extermination of all anti-Catholics, *including members of the Liberal Party.*"²⁶

The Catholic Church, therefore, notwithstanding all her tactical moves and dishonest opportunism, has remained fundamentally anti-democratic in essence, belief, and practice. Characteristics, these, which are fully shared by all her members.

And this is so by the mere fact that her members, having to obey their Church, are *ipso facto* put outside the pale of any truly democratic society—social or economic democracy being to them anathema, as it is to their Church. Which implies

that a good Catholic who claims to be also a good democrat is not only a contradiction in terms: he is an impossibility.

Such a statement may seem a rash one in view of the millions of Catholics in many countries who support democracy. That there are millions of such Catholics it would be foolish to deny. On the other hand, the contention that these are simultaneously good Catholics and good democrats cannot be accepted. And this for the following reasons:

- (a) If they are good Catholics, they will invariably prove to be hostile to democracy.
- (b) If they are good democrats, they will, on examination, prove to be bad Catholics, paying no heed to their Church.
- (c) If they claim and seem to be both good Catholics and good democrats, then they are hypocrites, and their acceptance of democracy or Catholicism is a pretence.

Category (a) as a rule are in a minority and will be found in every Catholic community. Category (b) usually can be met in nominally Catholic countries. Category (c) are found mostly in non-Catholic lands, particularly in the predominantly Protestant ones.

Even when Catholics have been thus screened and subdivided, there can still be found a substantial number of them who are good members of their Church and good members of society, and who are therefore good citizens. These can be found in substantial numbers in both Protestant and nominally Catholic countries, and are numerous in the latter. The more backward a country, the more numerous they will be there. They belong to the fourth category: to the ignorant rank and file of the Catholic masses.

Catholic masses, like all masses, have never excelled for the brilliance of their brains. The more ignorant they are in social, political, and, indeed, even religious matters, the easier for their leaders to use them as most pliable tools.

Following the Second World War, one of the major tasks of the Catholic Church was to cultivate the legend that she could, and in fact did, champion democracy. Many, especially Americans, came truly to believe the myth. This, thanks not

only to their individual lack of discernment, but mostly to their incredible ignorance about Catholic social teaching; an ignorance purposely cultivated by the Church herself.

Like all Catholic hierarchies, so also the American did not, of course, believe in such a fantastic legend. Yet they cunningly promoted the fable, in order to deceive simultaneously the credulous Catholic masses and their democratic governments, and hence also Western society. Their objective: the undetected undermining of democratic freedom. The word "freedom" has nowhere so ill a sound as in the Catholic Church. The Church knows only one kind of freedom: Catholic freedom, synonymous with total Church dominion over the individual, the State, and the community.

The claims of the Catholic Church that she is the defender of civic liberties, consequently, are deceitful, untrue, and dishonest. Her fundamental dictum in the past, as now, has always been the same old one :

I am in the right, and you are in the wrong. When you are the stronger you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.²⁷

That is something which had better be remembered, freedom having often been made to perish because of forgetfulness of some such simple truth.

As Catholics must look to the Pope in religious and moral matters, and as it rests with him to judge which law is just or unjust, it follows that Catholics, being primarily Catholics and secondarily citizens, owing their first obedience to their supreme leader, can be, and in fact are, the most dangerous instruments at the disposal of a power alien to the State, hostile to the basic tenets of freedom, and hence the greatest enemies of true democracies.

Their status becomes even more ambiguous when it is remembered that the Pope claims their absolute obedience independently of whether the State of which they are citizens is hostile or friendly, wholly Catholic, Protestant, or non-Christian.

Such obedience must not be given "in shreds," but must be perfected to the point where Catholics have to bow to the Pope "*as to God Himself.*" These last words, Papal words, are worthy, perhaps, of a fuller quotation :

Union of minds requires not only a perfect accord in one Faith, but complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, *as to God Himself.* This obedience, however, should be perfect, because it is enjoined by faith itself, and has this in common with faith, that it cannot be given in shreds.²⁸

The full significance of such a statement: the Catholic Church has the right to use Catholics against whomsoever—man, institution, or State—is hostile to her.

Men, institutions, and States upholding the liberties of genuine modern democracy fall into such a category.

It is no exaggeration to say, therefore, that Catholics are very dangerous to all those principles without which no democracy can flourish, and that they form *the most internationally anti-democratic party in the world.* Further, that, besides being members of a party, they are units of an army. More, that they belong to an organization which is both party and army, cemented as no other by an unshakeable belief that, having a spiritual as well as a political mission, it need stop at nothing in order to further its conquests. And its conquests are not confined to Western society. They embrace the whole world.

When Catholic principles are brought into the realm of practical politics, consequently, the smooth working of society, and hence of the internal and external life of States, can depend upon the decisions taken, not by the people represented by democratically elected congresses, parliaments, and governments, but by the Pope: a ruler standing aloof upon a hierarchical pinnacle, as the living embodiment neither of true religion nor of true liberty, but as the vulturine symbol of that most malignantly perilous of all totalitarianisms, the Catholic Church.

THE HIDDEN MIGHT OF CATHOLIC DIPLOMACY

POWER IS ORGANIZATION. WITHOUT IT, it could be so dispersed as to become nil. With it, it can be so strengthened as to become irresistible. The Vatican has erected its diplomacy upon both; that is to say, upon its diplomatic machinery and upon the religious machinery of the Catholic Church. The first could not function or, indeed, exist without the second.

It is the religious organization of the Catholic Church which, by endowing Vatican diplomacy with efficiency, provides it also with exceptional power. This is so, owing to the fact that in each of its official diplomatic representatives there is hidden a Catholic priest. As a priest is a blind cog in the vast organizational religious machinery of the Catholic Church, it follows that, being an integral part of it, he becomes automatically an integral part of Vatican diplomacy.

The significance of this is portentous. For it implies the partial or even total identification of Vatican diplomats with the Catholic hierarchy—namely, with all the countless religious and subsidiary lay units of the Catholic Church, functioning at every level and capable of reaching, with equal effectiveness, all rank and file. In concrete terms, this signifies that the

Vatican diplomat has at his disposal any of the Church's representatives, wherever and whenever he likes. This can mean a local bishop, but also the hierarchy of a whole country and, at times, even those of sundry lands, or, indeed, of the whole world.

The mobilization by Papal diplomats of the religious might of the Church is silently, smoothly, and efficiently accomplished whenever necessary. That is possible mainly thanks to the fact that the whole world has been divided and subdivided into numerous ecclesiastical provinces, whose headquarters are at the Vatican. These ecclesiastical areas—e.g. patriarchates, metropolitan sees, archdioceses, dioceses, prelatures, abbeys-nullius, vicariates apostolic, prefectures apostolic, missions, and smaller units—are headed by patriarchs, cardinals, archbishops, bishops, or minor ecclesiastics.

Such a vast ecclesiastical organization is kept together by the inflexible, unbreakable mesh of a global administrative net, spreading Catholic religious and political tentacles all over the world. At the top of it all there stands the Pope, the undisputed Head of both the Church and the Vatican. Under him, wholly subservient, there are the powerful heads of the religious, administrative, and political Congregations, round which the whole machinery of both Church and Vatican is made to revolve—e.g. the Prefect of the Congregation of the Propaganda of the Faith, known as the "Red Pope," and the Superior General of the Jesuits, known as the "Black Pope."

The "three Popes" can put the 1,500 bishops and archbishops scattered in all lands at the disposal of any of the Vatican's diplomatic representatives, who thus can employ the Church's machinery for each ecclesiastical area—of which there are almost 2,000 in the world—according to his needs.

To these can be added the missions, run by approximately 27,000 priests, 10,000 brothers, 62,000 sisters, and 85,000 catechists. The missions' exertions should not be underestimated. In the last twenty-five years they have increased from 400 to almost 600, Catholics under them from 15,000,000 to 28,000,000, native and foreign priests from 11,000 to 27,000, students in seminaries from 1,700 to 4,300, high schools from 1,600 to over 5,000. One missionary organization alone, the Pontifical Society of the Holy Childhood, for instance, within one

hundred years baptized 34,000,000 infants in non-Christian lands.

Besides the regular and missionary clergy, the nuncio has at his disposal all the vast machinery of the religious orders—e.g. the Salesians, with 16,000 members; the Religious Institutes, such as the Brothers of the Christian Schools, with about 15,000 members; the Monastic Orders, such as the Benedictines, with total of 12,000 professed members; the Franciscans with 24,000, the Jesuits with over 30,000, the total number of priests and other members of Orders of men running to over 220,000, and that of nuns and sisters to over 600,000.

Most of these are not contemplative: they are extremely active, and hence capable of widespread influence. As a rule they specialize in educational or social works—for instance, the Salesians, already mentioned, with their “lay priests,” whose main task is to run colleges and who look after 450,000 student pupils in sixty-four different nations; or the Company of St. Paul, whose main object is to fight the Church’s ideological enemies.

Other kinds of organization specialize in social problems or run technical training colleges, schools of journalism, propaganda, Press, films, radio, television.

Many, although not congregations in the strict meaning of the word, are nonetheless powerful, semi-religious units—e.g. the League of the Sacred Heart; the Apostleship of Prayer, whose object is the defence of the Pope and the spreading of Catholicism in the world. The members of most of such units usually run into millions. The League of the Sacred Heart alone totals over 30,000,000 adherents, and has its official organ published in forty languages.

Others are even more laicized, and have specific social and political tasks. For instance, the Sword of the Spirit, the Catholic Women’s League, the National Catholic Youth Council, and the Pontifical Aid Commission, which runs over 3,000 summer camps with more than one million children, and which, within one single year, distributed 37,000,000 bowls of soup. Other units specialize in helping destitute children, war orphans, students, refugees, returning soldiers, emigrants, and juvenile delinquents.

Thus, with the regular clergy, the missionaries and the reli-

gious, the Vatican has at its disposal a colossal army, 1,000,000 strong. But its strength lies not so much in its numbers as in its quality. For it must be remembered that it is an army formed by a highly disciplined *élite*, detached from personal or local ties, set apart, living their lives only for the service of the Catholic Church and hence of the Pope, and posted within the borders of every county, country, island, and continent. When it is remembered that each one of them, a blind instrument of the Pope, is tightly controlled from the Vatican, it is easy to see that the power of its nuncios can be strengthened, whenever necessary, not only in any ecclesiastical, missionary, or religious areas into which the country to which a nuncio has been appointed is divided, not only in the whole country itself, but often in a whole group of nations or, indeed, a whole continent.

Even this is not enough. To complement these activities the Vatican has at its disposal numberless other Catholic organizations whose tasks range from the distribution of pamphlets in the streets to lobbying in Congress. These were co-ordinated into one single movement in December, 1922, by Pope Pius XI, with his encyclical *Ubi Arcano*, and was called Catholic Action. Catholic Action is less an organization than a programme, and emphasizes the promotion of Catholic aims by the lay apostolate. Its activities embrace all fields, from the intellectual to the manual, from the social to the political.

Typical Catholic Actionists: the members of the Crusades of Leafleteers, a group who seek to make converts by sending pamphlets through the post and leaving them in buses, trains, telephone booths—e.g. Mr. Edward Starks, of Buffalo, U.S.A., who distributed one million pamphlets to non-Catholics.

Catholic Action may take the form of individual or mass letter-writing—e.g. Mr. John Duffy, of West Kilbridge, England, who since 1912 wrote 1,547 letters to editors in the cause of Catholic truth, of which 1,126 were published—or collective protest and intimidation directed at Deputies, Congressmen, Senators, and other politicians; or well-planned, persistent mass advertising, as done by the Knights of Columbus, of America, in their Catholic advertising campaign in the American Press, inserting their propaganda in news-

papers and magazines with a total circulation of over thirty million.

It can create a motion-picture censorship feared by the whole industry—e.g. the Legion of Decency in the U.S.A.; or go so far as to picket cinemas to prevent a film being shown once the Church has objected to it—e.g. after Cardinal Spellman called upon Catholics to boycott a film, hundreds of Catholic ex-Servicemen began to picket a New York cinema, declaring they would force the picture off the screen.¹

It can organize Catholics to fight a whole government for building blocks of flats instead of houses, on the ground that flats are conducive to divorce and that in them couples restrict the number of children to be born, for lack of space, and that hence the building of flats is an anti-Catholic policy—e.g. in Holland, where in 1947 the Catholic People's Party launched a family policy calling for wide concessions designed to help large families; or in Germany in 1951-2, when the Christian Democratic Union Party (Catholic) conducted a campaign for the building of separate family houses, calling any other decision a Communist scheme: this on the ground that the Socialists had justified the erection of large blocks of flats by pointing out that the one-child family had become common. In this last example, the fight was conducted not only in the Press but also in Parliament. Indeed, the whole of the Catholic Building Societies were mobilized and charged with building only houses, with the result that whereas, for instance, in the years between 1945 and 1948 Catholic agencies built 2,000 dwellings for 10,000 people, in 1949 they built 5,500 for 25,000 people, and in 1950 21,000 houses for 90,000 people.

The Premier of a country can become a Catholic Actionist on a grand scale. Like the Italian Premier, De Gasperi, by refusing to scrap a treaty favouring the Church—e.g. the Lateran Treaty and the Concordat, both signed by Mussolini—and by eliminating a national holiday—e.g. September 20—because it was in commemoration of the date when the Italians wrested Rome from the Popes in 1870. Or like Peron, Argentine dictator, when he granted an amnesty to many prisoners, in deference to the wishes of the Pope, to mark Holy Year, 1950.

Lobbying is Catholic Action of the same category. On an

even bigger scale is the engineering of colossal slander campaigns, in which pursuit Catholics are unsurpassed—e.g. the one started and carried out with immense political reverberations by Catholic Senator McCarthy against the U.S. State Department in 1950, 1951, and 1952.

Anything aimed at the direct or indirect furtherance of Catholic influence is Catholic Action.

This many-sided movement, it should be remembered, is world-wide. It can operate in the most unlikely regions. For example, in China, where sixteen Catholic representatives, during the Chiang Kai Shek regime, were members of the National Assembly, and largely through their efforts Archbishop Yu Pin, of Nanking, in 1947 succeeded in inserting a paragraph in the Constitution pledging the Chinese Government to a programme of social welfare along the lines of the Papal encyclicals. Catholic Action in China went so far as to persuade Chiang Kai Shek to have China's new Constitution take effect from Christmas Day, the date proposed by Archbishop Yu Pin, instead of from October 10, a national holiday, or November 12, birthday of Sun Yat Sen, the national hero: the equivalent of this being that Buddhists should succeed in including Buddhist teaching in the Constitution of the U.S.A., and make the national day the date of the birth of Buddha.

All such activities, great or small, when persistently carried out can ultimately become of great political significance. For Catholic Action co-ordinates them, not at any particular moment or in any given place, but perpetually, at all times, in all places, and by every means.

Their significance is even more ominous when it is remembered that they are directed by the hierarchy. Pius XII was very explicit about this: "The Hierarchy has the right to command and issue instructions and directions, and Catholic Action must place all its energies at the disposal of the Hierarchy" (1940). In short, at the disposal of the Pope, and hence of his representatives accredited to foreign governments.

In this way, the Vatican's representative is far more powerful than the representative of any nation, having at his disposal, besides the Catholic hierarchy of the country to which he has been sent, all the numerous religious institutions, organizations, and bodies, not to mention all good Catholics within that

country and, indeed, the potential power of the whole machinery of the Catholic Church, inside and outside it.

In addition to the above, the nuncio has at his disposal an essentially political weapon which at times can truly influence the national social, political, and economic life—namely, the Catholic Party.

The Catholic Party is animated by the principles of Catholicism, and its goal is to influence the political, moral, social, and cultural legislation of the nation in which it has been organized, with a view to harmonizing them with Catholic tenets.

In practically all nominally Catholic countries, and even in some Protestant ones, there have been or are powerful Catholic movements which, although claiming to have nothing to do with the Vatican, work in close and obvious co-operation with it; indeed, which are operated from Rome, where very often their policy, tactics, and grand strategy are conceived, directed, and made to work within the national and international framework of Vatican world policy.

A Catholic Party, generally speaking, is the most obvious political instrument employed by the Vatican to further the interests of the Church via politics. That being so, it follows that it must be in the closest touch with the political representative of the Vatican, i.e. the Papal Nuncio, who usually advises its leaders, informs the Pope of its activities, and, in short, becomes the unofficial liaison between a political movement in a given country and a political power, the Vatican, outside that country which yet directly interferes in the life of that country.

Sometimes, on serious occasions, this semi-official liaison is ignored, and the Party gets into direct touch with the Vatican, or vice versa. This has occurred many times since the Catholic Parties first came into existence—that is to say, from the time of Leo XIII, in the nineteenth century, when they were first formed in opposition to Liberalism. Since then they have multiplied in and outside Europe, and by the beginning of the present century, in close alliance with the Catholic trade unions, they were already extremely important. The most powerful, until the advent of Hitler, were the *Mittelpartei*, or Centre

Party, in Germany, the Catholic Party in Italy, the Austrian Christian Social Party, and many others with similar names.

From their first appearance they were openly acknowledged, both by the Catholic Church and by her members, to be political weapons intended to be used for the furtherance of Catholicism in the modern world; for the fight against Modernism, Secularism, Liberalism, and Democracy up to the outbreak of the First World War; and against any Left-Wing movements led by Socialism or Communism since then.

Their directives were and are very elastic, and are the mirror of the prevalent grand strategy of the Vatican in various parts of the world, according to political trends, so that these Catholic Parties advocate both the democratic and the authoritarian forms of government, and sometimes a mixture of the two.

Since their creation they have in monarchical countries supported kingships, while in republics they have restored monarchical rule. Before the First World War they were decidedly anti-Semitic. Between the two World Wars, most of them supported Fascism and, when they were not suppressed, became totalitarian. The most striking characteristic of the Parties was that in all cases they consisted practically one hundred per cent of Catholics. More often than not, priests and prelates were their most zealous members and their official leaders—e.g. Mgr. Kaas in Germany, Dom Sturzo in Italy, Mgr. Seipel in Austria, Mgr. Tiso in Slovakia—who never took a serious step without first conferring with the Papal Nuncios or direct with the Vatican.

After the Second World War they were resuscitated, and, owing to the growing urgency of social problems and the pressure of Socialism, they adopted a Christian-Social programme. In Europe they donned democratic attire, but remained authoritarian in spirit and practice. They were the Parties of the Centre or of the extreme Right, while in various countries they were openly reactionary.

Most of them, however, having been reborn in a democratized world, became mass parties with a popular platform and with emphasis on social problems. Hence some of them calling themselves Christian Social Parties. Parties of this type included the M.R.P. (*Mouvement Républicain Populaire*)

in France, the Christian Democrats in Italy, the Christian Socialists in Belgium, the Christian Democratic Party in Germany, the Austrian People's Party in Austria. Most political parties in Europe were, for all practical purposes, Catholic Parties. The Swiss and Dutch Catholic Parties were also important in their countries.

Others remained blatantly Fascist. For instance, Franco's Falange in Spain and Salazar's National Union in Portugal. And in Latin America the Catholic Parties continued to be the most reactionary political movements, being Fascist, clerical, and stubborn supporters of landlordism.

Each of these parties plays a paramount role in the political life of the country where it exists. Indeed, cases where they were the dominating political factors were by no means rare. In Spain and Portugal, for instance, they were for decades the only existing parties. In Europe, only a few years after the Second World War, reborn political Catholicism was at the head of ten European governments west of the Iron Curtain—i.e. Italy, Austria, Germany, France, Belgium, Luxemburg, Holland, Eire, Spain, and Portugal—whereas in Eastern Europe Catholic Parties, although greatly reduced and, indeed, suppressed, continued to be the centres of the fiercest opposition to the Communist governments, particularly in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary. In Central and South America Catholic Parties as a rule are in command of the fate of governments, when they are not governments themselves. Here again, organized political Catholicism is confined neither to Europe nor to the Americas. It is active in Africa and Asia. In Egypt there was a Christian Democratic Party composed of Catholics, Protestants, and Orthodox, but Catholic-dominated, in a country where Christians constitute about fifteen per cent of the total population of 20,000,000; and in Indonesia the Catholic Party played no mean part in the political life of the young Indonesian Federation.

.

Political Catholicism, however, does not show itself only as political parties. Often it is not organized as a political movement at all. It can be left as a loose amalgamation of Catholic activities, which, nevertheless, may make it no less powerful.

This happens in countries where the Vatican has decided it can promote its political influence by different means. For instance, in England.

In England, although with no Catholic Party, there is organized political activity on the part of the Catholic minority, whose weight, particularly at the Foreign Office, is at times disproportionate.

In view of the oblique working of political Catholicism, both in England and in the U.S.A., it might, perhaps, be useful to examine it at greater length than we have its typical exertions in other countries.

Political Catholicism in England deserves further attention as a remarkable example of how the Vatican can influence the social and political conduct of a nation without the people at large being in the least aware of it. Such unawareness is due mainly to the absence of any Catholic body dealing specifically with political matters. English Catholics have never seriously attempted to create a Catholic Party, or officially to organize themselves into a specific political body. On the contrary, they seem to distinguish themselves from the Catholics of other nations by the fact that they like to give the impression of being not at all concerned, *as Catholics*, with the political life of their own country. Hence the widespread belief that Vatican influence in English affairs is almost nil.

The reality, however, is otherwise. The complete absence of co-ordination of English political Catholicism is not due so much to the smallness of the British Catholic body—3,000,000 in a population of about 50,000,000. It is a well-calculated strategy of Vatican diplomacy, aware that England has always been extremely sensitive about the political nature of the Catholic Church. The remark made by Queen Victoria, "Am I still Queen of England?" when informed of the ecclesiastical changes made by the restoration of the hierarchy of England and Wales, decreed in Rome in 1850, was typical of the intense suspicion with which Protestant England has always regarded and still regards the claims of the Catholic Church, aware how such claims cannot be confined to religious matters.

Because of this it has been the main strategic rule of the Vatican to avoid any form of organized political Catholicism which might unduly awaken this dormant but real watchful-

ness. Hence the adoption of a diametrically opposite policy to that pursued in other lands. Political pressure here is exercised indirectly, unofficially, and mostly undetected by an extremely small Catholic group posted in key social and diplomatic positions.

This does not mean that the English hierarchy does not attempt to influence, as far as it dare, Catholic congregations and, indeed, even public opinion on social and political matters. It does, and at times forcibly.

Thus sermons can be openly preached against ideologies hostile to "Christian civilization" wherever such ideologies can safely be identified with certain political movements at home and abroad unpopular with the public and fought by the Vatican—e.g. Communism—or upon certain social issues, such as the question of Catholic schools, secular education, or just schools in general. Cardinal Griffin, for example, went so far as to ask the Labour Government that over 2,000 teachers in State schools, whom he considered to be Communists, should be dismissed (May, 1950).

This kind of pressure, as everywhere else, can yield concrete results in local and general elections, particularly where Catholics are strong. Mr. P. Piratin, Communist M.P., was beaten in spring 1950 by a Catholic, Mr. W. J. Edwards; and Mr. Gallacher, also a Communist M.P., after the same elections openly blamed Catholics for his defeat.

After these successes, the Catholic hierarchy became so bold as openly to declare that it was their hope and, indeed, intention to "hold the balance of power" in the political life of the country.

That such a proposal should come from a minority group of only 3,000,000 was not astonishing. It was even less so when it is remembered that, at the time it was publicly uttered, England found herself in the most awkward political situation. After five years of Labour government, the British electorate had returned Labour with only a small margin (1950). At a second general election, in 1951, Labour fell, and a Tory government, headed by Churchill, was returned in its stead, but, again, by a very narrow margin. Catholics saw in this an opportunity to play the role of the Catholic Centre Party in Germany before Hitler, as we shall presently see. The Catholic

Archbishop of Liverpool, referring to the way the country had been divided "pretty equally" between two parties, could not resist the alluring vision of political Catholicism dominating the House of Commons: "I think that this state of things will go on for some time," he said. "I hope it will, because the longer it goes on, the stronger will be our influence, as a Catholic body, and I think we may yet get the privilege of holding the balance of power . . . there is no doubt that the Catholic vote is becoming more and more important."²

These remarks were ominous, as they indicated in which direction English political Catholicism had begun to be orientated.

But where the unofficial Catholic pressure group begins to exert undue political influence in relation to its size is in the Press, the trade unions, and, above all, in the social and political upper strata.

From the beginning of the Second World War, Catholics infiltrated in considerable numbers into the British national Press (e.g. *Daily Mail*, *Daily Telegraph*, *Daily Express*, *Times*, *Observer*) and into the great British Press Trusts, such as the Rothermere and Kemsley groups, the popular weekly Press, and such other moulders of public opinion as the B.B.C. with more than remarkable success, Catholic individuals often holding positions which enabled them to exert a great influence in those specific spheres.

In the trade unions the Catholic Church penetrated with considerable success, supplemented by the main exponents of Catholic trade unionism or bodies dealing with Labour and Trade Unions, whose ultimate purpose was to sway the labour in general to pursue policies conforming to Catholic tenets.

These activities of a definitely political nature, although remarkable in themselves owing to their quasi-unobtrusiveness, pale into insignificance when compared with the influence exercised by the Catholic Church by her penetration into the higher social strata of English blood and money aristocracy. Several important aristocratic families, some very close to the Royal Family and personal friends of its members, were staunch Catholics (e.g. the Duke of Norfolk). Although officially their influence is restricted, yet unofficially it can be very great. Catholic influence from this quarter can be felt

in this manner throughout the upper social framework, as Catholics, in proportion to their numbers, are in considerable strength in the various social and political gradations. For instance, in 1950 there were about 130 Catholic peers and baronets, including 33 Catholic members of the House of Lords, 21 Catholic M.P.s, 3 Catholic Ministers,³ and, an important means of exerting Catholic influence in high quarters, 12 Catholic members of the Privy Council. All these were further strengthened by about 140 Catholic knights, many in important positions.

But where the Vatican is at its strongest is in the British Foreign Office, a veritable citadel of Vatican diplomacy. In 1936, by an actual count of policy-making officials, Catholics formed forty-one per cent of the whole Foreign Office permanent staff, which increased by twenty-two per cent after the Second World War.

The influence which the Catholic Church can exercise in the political life of the country via the Foreign Office has always been of paramount importance. It can profoundly affect the direction of British foreign policy on European and world issues. Before the Second World War it was the main instrument for destroying the Spanish Republic. This was accomplished mainly through the hypocritical and fraudulent policy of non-intervention, which stopped Mexico, France, and Russia from sending more than token supplies, while Fascist Italy could openly send more than 100,000 troops and Nazi Germany bomber squadrons and even submarines and battleships to the rebels. The British Foreign Office's policy of non-intervention, as a means of destroying the Spanish Republic, which the Pope had cursed and which Catholic generals were fighting, was inspired directly by the Catholic Church. From the very beginning, in fact, the Foreign Office had as its main consultant Mgr. Jackman, who acted on Vatican directives, and who greatly influenced the Catholic forty-one per cent of the Foreign Office's permanent staff. Result: English Catholics were able to write British foreign policy, which became almost immediately also American policy towards Spain, which finally resulted in the installation of Fascist Franco.⁴

After the Second World War Catholic influence increased a hundredfold. That this is no exaggeration can be gathered

from the fact that the two most important key posts of British diplomacy in relation to the paramount problems of the post-War era—namely Soviet Russia and Communism—were filled by two most zealous Catholics, Sir David Kelly, the British Ambassador to Moscow (1950-1), and Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick, British High Commissioner for Germany.

After Soviet Russia, Germany was the most important problem of post-War Europe. There, in 1949, Vatican diplomacy succeeded in installing a Catholic Chancellor, Dr. Adenauer. This in spite of the fact that the resurrected Catholic Party was not the largest West German Party and that Catholics throughout Germany were only about thirty-three per cent of the whole German population, the greater bulk being Protestants. This remarkable diplomatic feat was accomplished with the full support of the American State Department and of the British Foreign Office, so that it could rightly be said, as an American Senator put it, that the first West German Government was conceived in Rome and born in Washington.

The installation of a fanatical Catholic as the first Chancellor of West Germany contributed in a great degree to the reorientation of post-War Germany in a direction which was the main cause of the split in Germany and in the Western World. As the tension between Soviet Russia and the West grew, so West Germany's importance grew with it. One of the key positions at this period was that held by the three Western Powers still in occupation of Germany. Their High Commissioners had the decisive voice in practically all matters concerning the life of the country. Whoever held that position, consequently, shaped the internal political affairs of the part of Germany occupied by the country he represented.

At the most critical period of tension between the other occupying power, Soviet Russia, and the Western nations, Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick, Permanent Under-Secretary to the British Foreign Office, was appointed High Commissioner for Western Germany. It might have been a coincidence, but soon afterwards portents occurred. Nazi war criminals, duly tried and condemned by an International Court or by German Courts, began to be released with feverish frequency, and, to the incredulity and alarm of the majority in Europe and the

Americas, the German jails were soon almost emptied of their Nazi war criminals. The result of this policy was a swift re-emergence of Nazism, followed by the astounding news that one of the new neo-Nazi movements—the Socialist Reich Party, led by former Nazi General Remer, the man who gave Hitler another year of life by ruthlessly suppressing the July plot in 1944—during the elections held in May, 1951, sent sixteen Nazi Deputies to the State Assembly of Lower Saxony, the fourth strongest party in that State. This, only six years after the total collapse of Hitler's Nazi Germany.

Vatican influence, exerted indirectly, can similarly be felt further—e.g. in the various countries of the British Commonwealth, where there exist large and small Catholic minority groups. These have been known to be more prone to the combined suggestions of the British Foreign Office and the Vatican than, perhaps, to those emanating from any other quarters, including their own governments. Several Premiers of these countries have been or are Catholics (e.g. Canada, Australia, New Zealand), or have influential parliamentary Catholic pressure groups of their own (e.g. Australia).

The “unofficial” influence exercised by the Vatican, therefore, is important not only in England but also in most of the countries of the British Commonwealth, where there are more than 22,000,000 Catholics. It is felt in the international field, in connexion with issues affecting world problems, through the invisible yet concrete influential British Catholic minority, determined to further the interests of the Vatican by using the authority, experience, prestige, and influence of the British Foreign Office and other instruments of British policy-making at home and abroad.

In the U.S.A. political Catholicism, broadly speaking, is made to work on the model of the British, with some outstanding differences. Whereas British Catholicism is extremely cautious, secretive, and almost unrecognizable as a distinctive, peculiar political force, the American is vocal, dynamic, aggressive, although superficially, but not in reality, haphazard, incoherent, and disorganized. Whereas the British as a rule act via the conventional diplomatic channels, identifying national and Catholic interests in such a way that it is almost impossible to detect any “foreign” (i.e. Vatican) influence, the

American acts mostly via pressure-group methods. This has developed into the chief characteristic of American political Catholicism, peculiarly in keeping with the American political habitat, where public opinion, particularly if tackled on the emotional side, can be made to bear tremendous pressure upon local sheriffs or Presidents alike.

Catholic pressure groups, beginning with the Catholic vote, are political factors which no political candidate, big or small, can afford to ignore. The two major American political parties, before launching upon any major national or international policy, are always very careful to gauge first the reaction of the Catholic voter. Presidential elections are not exempt from this Catholic political sword of Damocles. A united Catholic *bloc* growing towards 30,000,000, whether for or against, can be decisive in the election of a new American President. Once elected, with or without Catholic support, a President is no safer than he was before. For the Catholic hierarchy can influence his political conduct with continuous blackmail via a perennial threat of withholding the Catholic vote or of using it at the next Congressional or Presidential elections. This continuous blackmail is more responsible for the domestic and particularly for the foreign policy of the U.S.A. than is generally realized.

The political pressure made to bear upon the President is fully shared by Senators and Congressmen, also the targets of political Catholicism, in inverse ratio to their importance.

Besides this, personal influence is no mean factor in adding to the pressure of American political Catholicism, when it is considered that Catholics have been and are being appointed with alarmingly increasing celerity to the highest positions of the land, both in the administration and in the armed services. E.g. General A. M. Gruenther, Chief of Staff of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Powers in Europe (February, 1951); Mr. Howard McGrath, the U.S. Attorney-General; Mr. Robert Hannegan, U.S. Postmaster-General; Maurice Tobin, America's Labour Minister, who advised the U.S. workers "to make it a 'must' to read the Popes' social encyclicals" (November, 1949, Detroit); Mr. Francis Matthews, Secretary of the U.S. Navy and Privy Chamberlain to the Pope, who advocated a "preventive" third World War, as we shall see later.⁵

The pressure of Catholicism, consequently, is disproportionate, not only in the political life of the U.S.A., but also in its profound repercussions abroad. The case of Franco's Spain is a typical instance.

In 1946 the U.S.A., with other nations, decided to withdraw its ambassador from Madrid and bar Fascist Spain from the United Nations. This in order to boycott a dictatorship based on the model of the defeated Nazi and Fascist ones, and as a sanction against Spain's collaboration with these during the Second World War. The Vatican promptly fought the ban, and mobilized political Catholicism to have it withdrawn. Catholicism in the U.S.A., like everywhere else, set to work. Gradually but steadily Catholic agitation, closely co-operating with powerful financial groups, began to make itself felt. And, by degrees, the American attitude started to change. By January, 1950, the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, had already said that the withdrawal of the ambassador to Spain had been a mistake. President Truman not long afterwards said that it would be a long, long time before the U.S.A. sent another ambassador to Spain. But on December 27, 1950, it was announced that an American ambassador had been appointed to Madrid.

That was not all. Franco had to have money as well. Catholic lobbying set to work. Agitation in the U.S. Congress to give Franco \$100,000,000 was at first rejected. Then Congressmen began to change when Catholic pressure groups in their States started to threaten them. A compromise was reached; Franco was given \$62,500,000. President Truman at first impounded the money, but then he too changed his mind and granted the gift. The Catholic pressure had been so blatant that Senator Morse had to admit that "Yes, most powerful lobbying" had engineered the Spanish loan,⁶ while an influential organ, at this startling development, commented editorially that "Generalissimo Franco" had "quite scores of unofficial Press agents in this country."⁷ President Truman himself could not bear the pressure of the Catholic "powerful lobby"; and this to such an extent that in the early part of 1950, irritated by the increasing Catholic persistence, while grumbling to a Senator about Catholics enforcing their political beliefs, "Yes," he said, "in recent weeks the State Department

has been shifting towards the Catholic view on Spain," because "recognition of Spain is at present one of the main political aims of Catholics."⁸ These political aims in 1952-53 resulted in a Spanish-American military alliance, with the granting of additional millions of dollars, *plus* American war materials, to the "Christian Gentleman" of Spain.

Catholic mobilization, it should be noted, was promoted simultaneously also outside the U.S.A., to strengthen the American Catholics' pressure upon the U.S. Government. This was achieved by the mobilization of the Latin-American countries, which sponsored the withdrawal of the ban. European Catholics had not stood idle. A former British Ambassador to Spain (in 1939-40) advocated the reinstatement of Fascist Spain, because the "English Catholics saw in Franco a saviour of Christendom." Belgium, which had a Protestant majority in Parliament when, in 1946, it proposed the U.N. resolution to withdraw ambassadors from Spain, had a Catholic majority when it voted in favour of Spain in 1950. In France, Holland, and even Switzerland Catholics agitated to have super-Catholic Spain as a senior partner in the anti-Communist crusade sponsored by the Vatican and the U.S.A.

Political Catholicism, therefore, should not be taken lightly. It is a force which is playing a major role in the political life of the West. Whether in the form of well-organized belligerent parties, or working disguised, as in England, or through pressure groups, as in the U.S.A., it is a most powerful instrument in the hands of the Church. It is even mightier when manipulated, as in fact it is, by Vatican diplomacy.

Political Catholicism is the pet creature of Catholic diplomatic slyness. Consequently it is not only treacherous, but extremely perilous, a concrete danger to all those liberties which it professes to uphold, but against which, in reality, it is battling, with a view to their final destruction.

11

CATHOLIC POWER OVER WORLD ORGANIZATIONS

THE VAST ECCLESIASTICAL MACHINERY of the Catholic Church, and her political lay battalions, would alone be sufficient to put Vatican diplomats in a unique position *vis-à-vis* the representatives of any other political Power, in so far as their use of the Church's religious and lay organizations enables them to exert a disproportionate influence upon, not only the government to which they are accredited, but also a large section of its population. Indeed, there are times when such influence can be exerted upon a whole nation by the simultaneous use of the diplomatic, political, and religious machinery which their ambiguous status puts entirely at their disposal.

Owing to this, Vatican envoys, more than diplomats, are potential disturbers of the peace, whom the State should watch with peculiar attention as the most insidious underminers of the liberties of the people.

Were their exceptional power confined within the borders of nations or even groups of nations, that would still be enough to put them into a special category. But their influence violates all national confines. This, thanks to the fact that, being the diplomatic counterpart of a religious unit whose field

is literally the globe, their influence is potentially world-wide. And it is world-wide, not so much because Vatican envoys are scattered all over the globe, but because they can exert direct diplomatic pressure upon groups or organizations dealing specifically with world problems.

It may be argued that this is not unique to the Vatican. Russia and the U.S.A. can do the same, by making a roll-call of either ideologically or economically subservient international organizations or, indeed, nations.

But the intangible lever of spiritual allegiance is far more powerful than the ideological or economic levers of Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. put together, cutting, as it does, across ideological, economic, and national ties: a feat very seldom accomplished with success by these last two Powers.

This the Vatican can do by using, in addition to the vast religious machinery of the Church and the political groups of European Catholicism, countless religious, semi-religious, and lay international organizations with world-wide activities, inspired and promoted by Catholic principles and practice. Thanks to this, the field of Catholic activities is of a truly universal character, and thus, being wholly independent of geographical, racial, and political confines, Catholic intervention is felt in the most diverse spheres and in the most distant regions.

A striking illustration is given by a well-planned calendar, indicating, in addition to the vast panoramic vista of Catholic exertions, specific Catholic efforts covering one year. The year happens to be 1952. But, with due variations, it could as well be 1953, 1954, or 1960:

- January: Relief of the Korean people from spiritual and material distress.
- February: Unimpeded development of Catholic schools in India and Pakistan.
- March: Preservation of the Faith in Latin America.
- April: Spread of the Catholic Press in mission countries.
- May: Defence of the family in Japan.
- June: Defence against the peril of atheistic materialism in the Middle and Near East.

- July : Lay Apostles in Indonesia.
August : Fidelity of the Chinese to the Church.
September : Avoidance of the danger of ungodliness in organizations for education and health.
October : The Pontifical Society of St. Peter Apostle for the native clergy.
November : Christian solution of the social problem in South Africa.
December : The Apostolate among natives of Asia and Africa who are studying or working in America and in Europe.

These religious and semi-religious activities are supplemented by parallel ones in the lay fields, mostly carried out by Catholic international and sometimes world-wide active organizations which, by strengthening Catholic influence in different fields, indirectly strengthen the Vatican's hand in social and political matters, in both regional and world assemblies.

Various Catholic international units, with specific tasks, operate in all spheres. They can range from that dealing with the problem of an international language to those dealing with sacred music or engineering. International congresses are regularly held in various parts of the world, but predominantly in Rome: e.g. the International Congress of Catholic Esperantists, the Apostleship of Prayer, with 25,000,000 members, the International Congress of the Missionary Union of the Clergy, the International Congress of Catholic Artists, the International Congress of Catholic Nurses, the International Congress of Sacred Music, the International Congress of Catholic Engineers. These have no obvious political significance.

Others, however, are more of a social, political, or ideological character. For instance, the world-wide Federation of Catholic Universities, linking together all the Catholic Universities of the world, from that in Washington to that in Peking, from that in Tokyo to that in Milan; the Pax Romana, an organization linking together Catholic students from fifty countries, including India, Ceylon, China, the Philippines, and Japan; the International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues.

representing 86,000,000 members in all parts of the globe, which tries to influence Parliaments not only upon moral and social issues, such as birth control, divorce and Catholic schools, but also upon specific political questions—e.g. official condemnation of Socialist principles, or of the Stockholm “peace appeal” in 1950; and the Union of Catholic Mothers, which also on many occasions promoted campaigns against collecting signatures for peace appeals, like the “appeal for peace to the women of the world,” launched by the Women’s International Democratic Federation (1951 and 1952).

Others are meant to influence media of propaganda, like the International Catholic Office of the Cinema, or put pressure upon social problems of many countries simultaneously, like the World Congress of the Apostolate of the Laity, or to deal with political matters on an international scale, like St. Joan’s International Social and Political Alliance, or the International Congress of Social Studies, or the International Catholic Emigration Commission.

These can seriously influence fields not directly connected with them, including non-Catholic ones, thus exerting world-wide power over Catholics and non-Catholics alike—e.g. the council of the World Medical Association, comprising over fifty nations, with a membership of 500,000 physicians, which, as already mentioned, under Catholic pressure adopted a resolution condemning euthanasia, in conformity with the doctrines of the Catholic Church.¹

The labour problem has been receiving increasing Catholic attention, with the result that the Catholic Church has entered the field full tilt. Besides the countless Catholic activities wholly or partially devoted to it, special Catholic international organizations have been set up—for example, the Young Christian Workers, which from Belgium has spread to over fifty countries, covering, besides Europe, the U.S.A., South America, and Africa; or the International Federation of Catholic Transport Guilds; the Belgian Federation of Christian Unions, with organized branches in the Belgian Congo.

Catholic penetration into organized labour, in the national and international spheres, is rapidly becoming a major influence. In the U.S.A. Catholic infiltration has been so successful that the most powerful Unions—e.g. the C.I.O.—

are dominated by Catholics or have Catholics at their head.

Catholic trade unions have been established in most countries, sometimes with a membership running into millions, rivalling Communist- and Socialist-dominated unions, and succeeding, besides splitting the labour field in Europe, in splitting it also throughout the world by the creation of a World Federation of Catholic Trade Unions.

These are directly controlled by the local hierarchy, and hence by the Vatican. In the Dutch and Belgian Catholic Unions, for instance, a priest attends all meetings of council and committees as an adviser. Since 1945 there has grown up an association of Catholic trade unionists built up from the parishes, and also craft-groups in the various unions which have played an active part in national and international events, particularly in the eradication of Communist influence. In Great Britain there exists the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists. There is a comparable organization in the U.S.A.

Political Catholicism, although not wholly responsible, was nevertheless a powerful indirect influence in setting up a new world federation of non-Communist trade union organizations, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, with an aggregate membership of 50,000,000.

The aims of the Catholic trade unions are the same as those of the diocesan associations: to encourage Catholic workers to join the trade unions, to take an interest in union affairs, to hold office in unions when fully trained, and to defend Catholic principles when they are attacked in trade unions.

Catholic activities in the labour field are not confined there. Cognate bodies spread Catholic influence in the domestic and foreign sphere—e.g. the International American Catholic Congress for Social Studies, which first put forward the original idea for the establishment of a Confederation of Workers wholly inspired by Catholic social doctrines—e.g. the institution of a feast of "Christ the Workman," to honour Christ as a model for manual workers; the creation of an International Christian Information Bureau, to unite European Right-Wing parties in their fight against Communism;² the launching of the Crusade for a Catholic Europe (first established in 1945).

All these international exertions, a characteristic feature of

the Vatican in the period following the Second World War, within a few years dealt with so many international and world-wide problems that it became necessary to create a Catholic "International of Internationals," centred in Rome, where the Presidents of the Affiliated International Organizations meet yearly to co-ordinate their activities on a world-wide scale.

.

The sum of all the activities of so many world-wide organizations, although unable *per se* to influence political international assemblies, can nonetheless, by strengthening the hand of the Church in so many branches of human endeavour, strengthen that of the Vatican in its efforts to exert diplomatic pressure upon international politics.

When to these are added organized political Catholicism, the religious convictions of Catholic politicians, and the spiritual injunctions exerted upon them by their Church, then we are faced with a political phenomenon of great import: the Vatican, which, although not represented at great international assemblies, can make its presence felt more forcibly than most of the official members.

For example, at the first European Parliament of the Council of Europe, established at Strasbourg after the Second World War. There the Vatican, in addition to trying openly to influence the representatives of various European nations and to oppose others, inspired plans directed at uniting the heavy industries of Europe for a most belligerent purpose, as we shall presently see. On more than one occasion, Mgr. Jean Julien Weber, Bishop of Strasbourg, celebrated High Mass for the success of the Council of Europe, at which he invited all the Ministers and Assembly Delegates to kneel side by side in the Cathedral. Asked the reason for such behaviour, the Bishop had no hesitation in declaring that: "I am doing what I can to point out their responsibilities to the numerous Catholic politicians." On being reminded that in that way he was trying to influence the European Parliament to become Catholic-inspired, the Bishop's reply was significant: "I intend to go on doing so."³ The Bishop, it should be remembered, had previously been instructed to "cultivate" the Delegates of the European Parliament by the Pope himself.

The Vatican can openly oppose the election of certain delegates to the European Parliament on the ground that they pursue a policy contrary to that of the Church. E.g. Catholic opposition to M. Spaak, former Belgian Premier, at the opening of the European Assembly in Strasburg (August 7, 1950), when he was proposed for re-election as the Assembly's President. The proposal was vehemently attacked by Catholic representatives of numerous countries. Dutch Catholics, by arrangement with the pro-Leopold Catholic Flemish representatives, took the lead, followed by Catholics of other nations, prominent among them the representative from Eire. Catholic opposition was due to the fact that, a few weeks before, Spaak had been most active in forcing the abdication of the devout Catholic King Leopold, who had almost risked civil war in order to reoccupy the throne, against the will of the majority of the Belgian people. King Leopold was supported by the Vatican. The Dutch had been briefed by the Vatican to oppose Spaak; but, notwithstanding this, he was re-elected President by ninety votes to twenty-three.

The Vatican can inspire such assemblies with plans directly connected with the promotion of wars. This, through prominent Catholic politicians. In 1950, M. Schuman, the French Foreign Minister, put forward to the Council of Europe proposals for a coal and steel merger of France, Germany, and other countries. The Schuman Plan, as it was called, had for its immediate aim the merging of all the industrial potential of Europe to increase the production of heavy industries. Heavy industries can benefit peaceful enterprise; they can also be armament industries. The real purpose of the merger was, not to increase the production of civilian goods, but to promote a colossal speed-up of war weapons to oppose Communist "Imperialism." This coal and steel merger plan, with its "much wider implications," was Catholic inspired. In the words of M. Schuman himself, it represented "the flowering of the intense social movement which was the work of European Catholics." ⁴

As a first direct result, the Americans—who, like the Vatican, had supported the merger—released from imprisonment as a war criminal Alfred Krupp, the German former arms king, reduced sentences on nine Nazi Generals and

eight diplomats, and reprieved twenty-one war criminals (January 30, 1951).

The Vatican, therefore, although "officially" not represented at the Council of Europe, exercised an influence as powerful as that of any major Power, simply via Catholic delegates who, although the representatives of numerous nations, yet were the members of the same and only true Church, whose plans it was their duty to further.

The Vatican, consequently, must be reckoned as a great European political Power. As such, it should never be underestimated, lest its undetected influence undermine, with undue slyness, the exertions of the European family of nations, striving to reach a working formula for long-sought European unity.

But the Vatican, besides being a great European Power, is something more. For, in addition to influencing councils dealing with the fate of a continent, it can sway assemblies responsible for shaping the destiny of the entire world—e.g. the League of Nations after the First World War, when the Secretary-General of the League was a devout Catholic;⁵ and the United Nations Organization after the Second.

As with the Council of Europe, so also with these, the Vatican "officially" was represented neither diplomatically nor politically. Yet, rare indeed were the occasions when its influence was not powerfully felt, or when it could not command the votes of whole groups of nations, as was so frequently done by the U.S.A. and, to a lesser degree, by Soviet Russia. The Vatican, with not a single official delegate, was one of the leading members of U.N.O., the "invisible" member, whose vote could stultify, at will, issues promoted by any nation.

The Vatican, as the "invisible" member of U.N.O., made its influence felt mainly in three ways:

- (i) by delegates who were Catholics,
- (ii) by using the votes of Catholic countries,
- (iii) by an intimate alliance with the dominating power in U.N.O.—i.e. the U.S.A.

Delegates of Catholic countries were mostly Catholics, often zealous ones. These were supplemented by individual Catholics who, although not representing any member nation, yet could powerfully influence important problems—e.g. the Chief of the United Nations' Status of Women Commission; ⁶ by members of the Catholic hierarchy sent as official advisers to a national delegation at U.N.O.—e.g. Bishop O'Brien, Auxiliary to Cardinal Gilroy, Archbishop of Sydney, as official adviser to the Australian delegation to the U.N. General Assembly (September, 1950); and by individuals representing non-Christian countries—e.g. Moslem Pakistan sent Mr. Charles Lobo, former Chief Justice of Sind (1950); Buddhist South Korea sent its Foreign Minister, a most fervent Catholic; Hindu India sent the Rev. Jerome D'Souza, a Jesuit, who, besides being an Indian delegate to U.N.O., was a member of the Parliament of India.

Thanks to its "invisible" membership, the Vatican could mobilize the votes of many countries. E.g. after the Second World War, most European nations being in the hands of Catholic Parties, their delegates could easily be briefed from Rome on all issues, while the Latin-American *bloc* formed a permanent unit servile to the Vatican, and was, perhaps, even more important than the European one, as the Latin-American countries could command forty per cent of all U.N.O. votes, although representing only seven per cent of the world population. This in contrast to Russia and India, with only two votes, and China, with no vote at all, although these three represented 1,000,000,000 human beings, almost half of mankind!

Owing to such a disparity of forces, it is easy to imagine how the mobilization of the Catholic *bloc* could carry the day at a mere wish of the Vatican.

Last, but not least, the "invisible" member could strengthen even further its Catholic *bloc* by co-ordinating it, or aligning it, with the dominating power in U.N.O.—i.e. the U.S.A.

By the skilful use of such forces the Vatican can sometimes exert a political power in world affairs which is superior even to that of the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia, with their respective ideological and economic satellites, put together.

We have already seen how the Catholic pressure groups in the U.S.A. forced the American Government radically to alter its attitude towards Franco. Catholic pressure, while at work in the U.S.A., had been mobilized also within U.N.O. Perhaps it will help if we recapitulate the case. Immediately after the end of the Second World War Spain was practically the only fortress of Fascism to remain intact. As the chief Nazis were hanged, so Catholic Spain was branded a Fascist nation. After this the General Assembly of U.N.O., in their decision of 1946, urged all the member-nations to withdraw their ambassadors and ministers from Madrid, to bar technical activities from Spain, to forbid financial aid, and similar sanctions, as a concrete proof of the world's abhorrence of a regime patterned on those of Hitler and Mussolini. At this period the temper of the nations, just emerged from the bloody Fascist war, could not be too lightly defied. And so the Vatican, although expressing disapproval of the U.N.O. decision, kept ominously quiet. Its silence, however, was only superficial. For it immediately began countless discreet exertions, which came increasingly to the fore as the world was being mobilized for the third World War.

These activities yielded their first concrete results when finally, in the spring of 1949, a proposal inspired directly by the Vatican was put forward to U.N.O., to secure the annulment of the General Assembly's decision of 1946. The proposal failed by *only two votes* to obtain the two-thirds majority.

The Vatican changed tactics. Instead of putting direct pressure upon U.N.O., it switched this against the power dominating U.N.O., i.e. the U.S.A., which, it should be noted, was in 1946 one of the prime movers against Franco's regime. The American hierarchy, the Catholic Press, and the whole Catholic-American machinery were duly mobilized. And in no time, as we have already seen, the State Department had to change its mind.

Having made certain of the support of the U.S.A., the Vatican thereupon resumed its direct frontal attack. The Latin-American countries—with the exception of Uruguay, Guatemala, and Mexico, who voted against it—were again briefed to bring the vexed question of relations with Spain

before the United Nations, which they did in October, 1950.

The result was soon evident. The proposal gained a conclusive majority, thirty-seven votes to ten, with twelve abstentions. The special committee of U.N.O. revoked the ban on diplomatic relations with Spain and the prohibition against her membership. Financial loans from the U.S.A. preceded and followed this move. The Vatican, which had worked by words and deeds for Franco's cause, had won another victory.

.

While promoting the recognition or the admission of any given State into the comity of nations, the Vatican can equally help to brand another, and, indeed, help to exclude it, China being a striking case in point.

Since its inception in 1949 Communist China was stubbornly boycotted by the U.S.A., who refused to recognize it as the legitimate Chinese Government. American hostility did not remain theoretical; it was concrete. It continued to support, finance, and arm Chiang Kai Shek, entrenched in Formosa; to oppose Red China becoming a member of the United Nations. In this it was entirely supported by the Vatican, which on more than one occasion openly stated that all countries should oppose "the admission of Red China to the U.N.,"⁷ condemning those who, like Britain, had recognized Red China, labelling such recognition "a mockery,"⁷ going so far that, after the outbreak of the Korean War (June, 1950), American armies, notwithstanding repeated warnings from the hitherto neutral China, rushed towards the Manchurian frontiers, with an unheard-of disregard for the national susceptibilities of Peking. The equivalent of this provocative action would have been if Chinese Red Armies had landed in Mexico, had defeated a Mexican rebel army sponsored by the U.S.A., and had then rushed towards the U.S. frontier, proclaiming at the same time that their object was to destroy American Capitalism.

China acted as the U.S.A. or any other country would have done in such a case: it crossed the border and threw the American armies back almost to the sea. This was self-defence, justified also by the fact that twice in the recent past had Korea been used as a doorway for the invasion of China.

At this turn of events the U.S.A. had the impertinence to propose to the U.N. that they brand Red China as an "aggressor," mobilize all their diplomatic, economic, and military forces, and, indeed, declare war against China.

The U.S.A.'s proposal shocked the world to such an extent that *not a single nation* of the sixty comprising the United Nations came forward to support the American motion. All subsequent American efforts, in spite of the tremendous pressure it exerted upon the usually docile U.N.O., failed. Again not a single country would sponsor America.

At this point, what neither the power of the U.S.A. nor the hatred and fear of Communism could do, the Vatican did. The Latin-American countries were briefed by the Vatican to side with the U.S.A. and to support the American motion for economic and military measures against Red China. And within a few days the U.S.A.'s resolution was unanimously endorsed by the Central and South American States (January 20, 1951). The ultimate result was that, not long afterwards, the combined Catholic-American pressure brought into line most of the European governments.

The importance of the Vatican's support for the American plan can be gauged by the striking fact that, whenever the U.S.A.'s economic pressure was not strengthened by the invisible religious pressure of the Vatican, there American efforts failed miserably. It is significant that this occurred mostly with non-Christian countries.

The case of China, besides bringing to the fore the power which the Vatican could command within the United Nations, brought also to the fore a no-less-sinister fact: the ruthless blackmailing technique used by the U.S.A. to force members of a World Assembly to vote according to the American decision. This occurred in connexion with India.

Immediately prior to and almost at the same time as the Chinese issue, India had made an urgent request to the U.S.A. for 2,000,000 tons of wheat. As the spectre of famine had appeared in various Indian provinces, prompt decision on purely humanitarian grounds would have meant the avoidance of thousands dying of starvation. The gravity of the crisis can be judged by the fact that the famine was threatening to become "the worst famine in Indian history." The issue of

branding Red China had, meanwhile, come to the fore in U.N.O. India not only proved to be against the American resolution, but became the leader of the Asian-Arab nations opposing it, on the ground that it would needlessly antagonize most of the Asiatic peoples.

It was important for the U.S.A. to "persuade" the leading Asian-Arab nations to bow to its will, the Latin-American *bloc* being not quite sufficient to obtain a majority vote. In view of the Indian refusal to acquiesce, the American economic "pressure principle"—the equivalent of the Vatican's "religious" one—was set in motion, and the American Senate Foreign Relations Committee took an ominous step. It decided to delay action on India's urgent request for wheat until Indian opposition to the American policy on Communist China had ceased.⁸

This, duly publicized, was timed, not only for when various European and Asiatic countries had begun to waver in their resolve to stand firm against the U.S.A., but also, and this should be noted, after alarming reports of the famine in India had just been released throughout the world. Two days later (January 30, 1951) the American State Department, to make matters worse, gave wide publicity to a statement to the effect that there was "no doubt" that India urgently needed food grain "to avert a most devastating famine."⁹

The official and unofficial spate of publicity was a means calculated to put further pressure upon India by influencing the Indian Government via Indian and world public opinion and thus compel it to support the American policy in order to remove the obstacle to the swift granting of 2,000,000 tons of wheat, to prevent the death of numberless innocent people.

American ruthlessness was so blatant that influential organs, such as the *New York Herald Tribune*, did not hesitate openly to condemn it. America should not "mix up human misery with domestic or international politics," that paper said, "by withholding food from the famine-stricken masses of India because it disagrees with the foreign policy of the Indian Government. . . . Yet the Department picked the moment when the Indian-American disagreement over China was the hottest to approach Congress. . . . Let us not defame ourselves and let people die of hunger because their government

did not vote as our government would like that government to vote.”¹⁰

American blackmailing pressure continued for several months, until it was suddenly modified. Mr. Nehru, the Indian Premier, one day told Parliament (May 10, 1951) that Russian ships carrying wheat were on their way to India. Two weeks after this announcement (May 24, 1951) the U.S. House of Representatives voted to grant a loan to India to buy 2,000,000 tons of grain.

The economic pressure exerted upon India by the U.S.A. on the one hand, and the religious pressure of the Vatican upon the Latin-American *bloc* on the other, are, admittedly, extreme cases. Yet they are typical of the combined American-Catholic “pressure” upon a World Assembly—combined pressure which is by no means rare.

Vatican influence in the promotion of American foreign policy and in the swaying of major decisions of the United Nations is very often decisive. Without it numerous Western nations would not be forced to bend to U.S. economic pressure sufficiently to satisfy the U.S. leaders. In the case of China it was a success. Various European nations, most of them with Catholic governments, in addition to the South American *bloc*, turned the tables in America’s favour, and the United Nations Assembly, only two weeks after it had refused to adopt the American motion, passed it, in accordance with the will of the U.S.A., by indicting China as an aggressor by a final vote of forty-four to seven, with nine abstentions. The supporters were almost all Christian nations, some of which were either wholly Catholic or had powerful Catholic pressure groups in their midst. Those who voted against, or abstained, were either non-Christian or, if Christian, were Communist, where Vatican pressure was nil.

The intervention of the Vatican had once more decisively influenced a major move of a world assembly where even the economic pressure of the U.S.A. had failed.

Another no less ominous success was that connected with American espionage activities. After the American Government had passed its notorious American Mutual Security Act, 1951, by which American Intelligence was granted another \$100,000,000 for espionage and sabotage activities inside Com-

munist countries—as seen in an earlier chapter—the Act was brought before U.N.O., where members were asked to condemn it as “an aggressive act and interference in the internal affairs of other States.”¹¹

Many U.N.O. members, since the Act's inception, had expressed their disapproval, some of them protesting that it was “an aggressive act” directed “for the invasion of another State and the overthrow of its Government.”¹²

The United Nations Assembly for some time was decidedly against the American motion for the approval of the Act. The routine pressure of reducing dollar-aid to sundry member-nations, while lining up some, had no effect on others. Vatican “briefing” was set in motion, with the inevitable result. On December 21, 1951, the automatic American-Vatican majority had its way by thirty-nine votes to five, and eleven abstentions.¹³

That Vatican influence in U.N.O. could at times be even more powerful than that of the U.S.A. was proved on more than one occasion. There are on record cases when the Vatican defeated, single-handed, not only a strong opposition within U.N.O., but the whole of U.N.O., supported by the U.S.A. itself.

One of such cases occurred in 1948-9, in connexion with the then extremely thorny issue of the status of the Holy Land, and particularly of Jerusalem. The Vatican wanted internationalization of Jerusalem and the surrounding territory. Numerous countries—and, for a change, also the U.S.A., very sensitive about its 5,500,000 Jews—opposed such a plan. The Vatican briefed its American “Grey Eminence,” Cardinal Spellman, “to contact all” Catholic members of U.N.O. In no time, the Catholic votes were mobilized *en bloc* for the next session.¹⁴ In December, 1949, when the issue was debated, to the astonishment of many the U.S.A. and the others who had opposed the Vatican's plan were defeated.

Israel did not, however, submit to the decision, with the result that the issue continued to be an open sore in Israel-U.N.O.-Vatican relations for many years.

The advice of an official organ of the Church, in connexion with the mobilization of Catholic votes within U.N.O., is illuminating:

It is necessary to bring pressure to bear on the representatives in the United Nations of the Catholic nations, so that they form a granite-like block in the defence of the Internationalization of Jerusalem, as approved by the U.N. in December, 1949.¹⁵

The victory on the issue of Jerusalem was a minor one. But the Vatican had once more demonstrated that, whenever the opportunity arises, by mobilizing vast spiritual forces at its disposal it can become a most redoubtable power, capable of defeating enemies and friends alike, and is, therefore, an "invisible" member of U.N.O., to be wooed and supported, lest its power be directed against anyone not befriending it.

.

The Vatican, however, acts not only as a kind of super-lobby in the World Parliament, solely to promote its political activities. It has invaded another sphere, not so much in the lime-light but one which, perhaps, in the long run is no less important, the United Nations' cultural facet, U.N.E.S.C.O.

Here the Vatican's exertions were directed at "orientating" a world-wide body whose decisions could affect the culture of many nations and hence of millions of Catholic, non-Catholic, and even non-Christian peoples.

The Catholic Church not only set up organizations "to orientate all this international activity," to "watch influences [in Unesco] which are not strictly Christian," and "to study the declaration and documents of these post-war bodies and call attention to both about what is good and what is bad in them from the Catholic point of view," but it continually urged Catholics to penetrate into such organizations in order to influence them in accordance with Catholic teaching. "We must learn how to penetrate these U.N. agencies, to exercise influence on their decisions, which are binding upon the affiliated nations. We must assert our rights."¹⁶

Following such dicta, Catholic pressure is directed at raising obstacles against any plans not approved by the Catholic Church: such as, for instance, that of giving European children fair, unbiased history books. This occurred after Unesco had announced "plans for a booklet designed to help writers of improved history text-books" underlining "Unesco's philosophy of education for international understanding"

(October, 1950). The scheme contemplated the exchange of books between "experts" of neighbouring countries, for the purpose of reciprocal criticism. This system was not new. It had already been in use among five Nordic countries, including Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, since 1937. In these lands no history text-book was published without prior examination and criticism by the "experts" of the other four countries. Unesco's idea was to extend this scheme to the whole of Europe. Paramount opposition came from the Catholic delegates, who objected, on the grounds that history must be taught only according to the Catholic Church and not by an "impartial body" which might show the Church in a bad light.¹⁷

Catholic ostracism of the issue of unbiased books by impartial international bodies or writers is not confined to history books dealing with a Christian continent such as Europe. The Catholic Church attempts to dictate how history should be written for the Buddhists, the Hindus, the Moslems—indeed, the whole of the human race.

Is a history of the world being planned, with a view to having it translated into fifty or sixty languages, so as to reach all peoples, everywhere? Such a history then, must be written according to the Catholic historical interpretation—read, Catholic distortion of world events.

In 1952 the United Nations' Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization appointed Dr. Ralph E. Turner, chairman of an editorial committee, to produce a 3,000,000 words *History of Mankind*, which, it was expected, would be "the most influential history ever produced." A sum of \$600,000 was allocated for the work, to be published in 1957.

As soon as the appointment was announced, the Catholic Church was mobilized, from the representatives in U.N.O. of the U.S.A. to those of the tiniest Latin-American republic. Their task: to oppose the nomination of Turner, "the Atheist," and of his team of nine members, "none of whom is known as a Catholic and none of whom is from a Catholic institution."

The American N.C.W.C. began a campaign in the U.S.A., and the American hierarchy and Catholic lay organizations, including the scapular-bemedalled Knights of Columbus, set in

motion their pressure-group machinery to force the U.S. Government or the American delegates to U.N.O. to exert their influence to have the team of "Atheists" dismissed.

The Vatican protested. Catholic Action in sundry lands used all kinds of political and social chicanery to have the production of the history stopped—or at least modified according to the dicta of the Catholic Church. The campaign, which began in 1952, gathered momentum from then onwards.

The Vatican's efforts can be directed at "orientating" education proper. By trying to influence a body like Unesco to adopt certain formulas in harmony with Catholicism it might one day solve the Church-versus-State problem of education in numerous countries at one single stroke. The Vatican has already made several remarkable attempts in that direction. E.g. during the Fifth Session of the General Conference of the United Nations' Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Unesco,¹⁸ in which fifty-six nations took part, when Catholics tried to "orientate" the Congress "in regard to education, science, and culture," and bitterly criticized its education programme because it advocated Separation of Church and State—namely, the State's educational neutrality in connexion with religion. Catholic penetration went so far that, by 1950, the Vatican was bold enough to send an "official observer," no less a person than the Papal Nuncio to Italy, assisted by a team of six ecclesiastical and lay experts, this Vatican delegation being supported by such powerful additional Catholic voices as that of the head of the U.S.A. delegation, Mr. Howland Sargeant, and of the Director of the Educational Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Mgr. Frederick Hochwalt.

The disproportionate Catholic strength at such assemblies can be gauged by the fact that, although nations from all over the world came to the Conference, one out of three was Catholic. This is even more striking when it is remembered that, whereas Catholics number 400,000,000 the world population is more than 2,400,000,000 (1952).

The Catholic Church can affect policies concerned with the population of the globe. To a body like U.N.O., this is a problem of immense consequence. Its handling requires global planning. That means that peoples of diverse religions

and political background must agree on some fundamental principle by which to develop a scheme to check, reduce, or stabilize an otherwise uncontrollable increase. One of the schemes urged by the United Nations was, as we have already seen, the propagation of birth control as a short-cut solution to food and population problems, particularly in the Far East. Among concrete recommendations put forward was one favouring a network of birth control clinics in India, Pakistan, and China.¹⁹ Catholic delegates, as always, attacked the scheme, sabotaged the idea, and proposed that the Catholic doctrine condemning birth control should replace the plan for reducing world population, thus blatantly attempting to impose the Church's religious doctrine upon a global scheme affecting non-Catholic and even non-Christian peoples.

The Vatican can use national and international organizations in order to mobilize world public opinion against its enemies: e.g. during the trials of Archbishop Stepinac in Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary, when both prelates were found guilty of conspiring to overthrow their respective governments. The Vatican organized a world campaign, picturing them as innocent victims of Red terror, via the pulpit, the Press, radio, films, with the result that in no time individuals and governments alike became genuinely convinced that the Catholic Church was being persecuted, simply as a religion. This went so far that the Vatican used U.N.O. as a world platform, charged Hungary with having violated human rights by imprisoning one of its cardinals. This while simultaneously Franco was executing Communists in Spain for having taken part in the Civil War a whole decade earlier.²⁰

U.N.O. in view of the absurdity of the Vatican charge, proposed to withdraw this motion. Uruguay opposed the withdrawal (September, 1950), and Catholic pressure was redoubled. Thanks to Catholic mobilization, the motion was not only retained on the agenda but in October, 1950, by a vote of thirty to fifteen, it was given priority on the agenda of a Special Political Committee. At the same time, the Catholic lobby in Washington was made to work on the State Department, and not long afterwards the U.S.A. Secretary of State came forward with a formal request to reopen the case in the

United Nations. In the following month (November) the Assembly adopted a resolution denouncing Russia's Balkan satellites, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, "for violation of human rights." The resolution was introduced by Australia and adopted in the General Assembly by a vote of forty for and five against, with twelve abstentions. The success of the Vatican's pressure can be judged by the fact that it succeeded in mobilizing not only Catholics throughout the world, but also the Protestant Churches and, indeed, democratic and even Socialist governments. This mobilized world opinion to such a pitch that it led to the decision to seek an opinion on the proceedings of the trials from the International Court of Justice.

The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty was the first time in four hundred years that a secular court had thus arraigned a member of the College of Cardinals, but it was also the first time that the Catholic Church, through the Vatican, had mobilized practically the whole world in her favour, playing the role of a persecuted religion, when in reality she had conspired as a political Power to overthrow the legal governments of independent sovereign nations.

The representative of the Vatican is the representative of a power operating the immense machinery just described. Owing to this, he cannot be compared with the ordinary diplomatic representatives which countries accredit to each other. For he is the envoy of a world Power, claiming to be above the country to which he has been attached.

The appointment of a nuncio, therefore, does not represent a regular exchange of diplomatic representatives between two sovereign States, the nuncio being the official agent of a Power claiming partial or complete sovereignty within and outside the country to which he has been accredited, with the ability to mobilize part of the nation and even the whole nation against the government itself. And this owing chiefly to one simple fact: that he is the political envoy of a State within a State, obeying a super-State, the Vatican.

12

NATURE AND EXERTIONS OF VATICAN DIPLOMACY

THE VATICAN, THEREFORE, HAS AT its disposal a machine without equal; of immense efficiency, flexibility, power of penetration, and scope; to be operated on a local or on a global scale, at any time or in any place, to bolster up, to exert pressure upon, to undermine, or to wage war so as to further the interests of the Church.

Its representatives can use its tremendous power, either wholly or partially, simultaneously or independently, according to whether the task involved is a local or international one, while the Secretary of State can employ it, not only when dealing with supra-national issues, but frequently to strengthen the hand of a particular nuncio, to intimidate a stubborn government, or otherwise to make the weight of Catholic diplomacy felt, wherever necessary.

Although officially enjoying only diplomatic status, the nuncios *de facto* enjoy also religious and political standing. For, in addition to representing a diplomatic Power, they represent also a religious and political authority, identified in the same individual—the Pope. And, as his representatives, they become diplomatic, religious, and political leaders, to whom the hierarchies and the religious, semi-religious, and lay

organizations of the countries to which they have been posted owe blind obedience.

Whenever it is useful for them to do so they do not hesitate to add to their weight, by employing freely such vast sources of religious and political power, either to strengthen their diplomatic pressure or, indirectly, to force the hands of governments when diplomatic methods alone are insufficient.

Thus, although the government to which he is accredited sees in a Papal Nuncio only a diplomat, that same diplomat is also a political and religious representative, sent for the express purpose of intervening in the religious and political affairs of that government. A Papal representative, therefore, owing to his triple nature, status, and task—i.e. diplomatic, religious, and political—has a status all his own. Consequently, when exchanging diplomats with the Vatican, a nation must act accordingly, as the rules of normal diplomacy here are not only at fault, but useless. This is so, because the nuncio, when acting in his triple capacity, has the power to operate religious, social, and political forces which, although integral parts of the country to which he has been attached, yet once mobilized can be made to act wholly independently of their own government. In such cases the nuncio's orders are usually faithfully carried out; although individual Catholics—or movements—might at times rebel, they are expelled from Catholic organizations and sometimes from the Church herself. This happened to Bishop Mgr. C. Duarte Costa, a Brazilian bishop, excommunicated in 1945 for his exposure of the Hispanidad movement in the Brazilian See and in other American countries, Hispanidad being the Falange of Fascist Franco, transplanted in Latin America. And to the Italian Catholics who started a movement called the Catholic-Socialist and were excommunicated in 1946. And to two Polish priests, members of the Warsaw Parliament, who, in 1947, were suspended for refusing to withdraw from the Communist-directed government. And to the super-Catholic Action Française, whose leaders were excommunicated in 1927 for having scorned, first, the political directives of the Papal representative, and then even those of Pius XI. When dealing with a Papal Nuncio, a State consequently must be extremely careful not to antagonize the power he represents, which, being simultaneously of a religious and

of a political nature, can be made to operate from the top to the bottom of the structure of a whole nation.

For should antagonism arise, the nuncio would come to the fore, not as a diplomat, but as the leader of powerful forces which, although within the country, yet are closely arraigned behind him; should that occur, the government would be attacked from the pulpits of cathedrals and parish churches, by the Catholic Press, Catholic trade unions, the Catholic Party, and Catholic organizations of all kinds, down to Catholic individuals. Catholic Deputies would vote against it in the Chamber, journalists would write hostile articles, financiers would withhold money, the hierarchy would tell the faithful not to pay taxes, would incite them to civil disobedience, would organize passive and often active armed resistance—indeed, when necessary, even civil war. In short, all the complicated and immense web of Catholic machinery would be brought into action to exert pressure against individuals, authorities, the government, or the State which incurred the hostility of the nuncio—or to be more precise, of the Vatican, represented by the nuncio.

Technically speaking, the Papal representatives are divided into three main classes, all of them ecclesiastics. Born Legates (*Legati Nati*); Sent Legates (*Legati Missi*), or Legates “from the side” (*a latere*) of the Pope; and Resident Legates.

A *Legatus Natus* holds an ecclesiastical dignity to which the power of a legate has been attached. In the Middle Ages they were extremely important personages who presided at synods, acted as judges of appeal, and whose decisions could be reversed only by the Pope.

The *Legati Nati* were gradually superseded by the special Legates (*a latere*) who for the last three or four centuries have been the main representatives of the Vatican, accredited to the various governments of the world. A *Legatus a latere* is sent by the Vatican for special purposes, and as soon as his business is done he returns to Rome.

Legates with stable governments belong to the class of Resident Legates. Of this category, those who represent the Vatican with the most important Powers are known as nuncios, while those residing with second-class governments or in peculiar religious-political circumstances are known as inter-

nuncios or apostolic delegates. A cardinal, when serving as a nuncio, is known as a pro-nuncio.

As a rule a nuncio is accredited to Catholic countries. For Protestant and non-Christian lands, the Vatican selects its representatives according to the peculiar political or religious status of each country. This sometimes creates difficulties. One of them is a result of the Vatican's ancient claim, as already mentioned, that as it is above all secular governments its representatives must enjoy a privileged diplomatic status, and hence its nuncios must be officially recognized as the deans of the diplomatic corps, in the capitals at which they are accredited. This is accepted as a normal procedure in Catholic countries, but is rejected in Protestant and non-Christian ones. Whether nuncios, inter-nuncios, delegates, or local hierarchs, once briefed by the Vatican to act as its diplomatic representatives, they all act as the agents of both a political power, the Vatican, and of a religious institution, the Catholic Church—a combination which, by making them far more powerful than the diplomatic representatives of a secular State, enables them to influence the life of any given country to a degree which, besides being harmful, can be very dangerous for the liberties of a truly independent nation.

.

The countries to which a nuncio may be sent, roughly speaking, can be placed in four main categories: friendly countries; neutral countries ready to come only half way; countries unable officially to make any agreement with the Church, but whose governments want to keep in close touch with her; and, lastly, countries which refuse to have anything to do with the Vatican.

When the nuncio is faced with a friendly country whose government promises to work hand-in-hand with the Church, a treaty is signed. This, as we have already seen, is called a concordat.

In the case of a neutral, or even hostile, country, to avoid alienating her Catholic citizens, or of one where the separation of Church and State is strictly observed, a compromise is usually reached, and a *modus vivendi* is agreed upon. Occasionally, such a country cannot sign a concordat or even officially

reach a *modus vivendi*, when another compromise is found. The government sends to the Vatican a special envoy or personal representative, who has no official mandate, but usually does the work of an ambassador, while the Vatican's representative is either an apostolic delegate or (and this is more usual) a high national dignitary of the Catholic Church. This is what occurred with England, where there exists a national Church whose head is the King, and where there can therefore be no official permanent diplomatic interchange with the Pope. Notwithstanding this, England has officially recognized the Vatican since 1929, on the lame excuse that, as the Vatican is an independent State, it is legal for the English Queen to be represented at the Papal Court by a minister plenipotentiary. The Vatican, however, was not then permitted to appoint the equivalent in Great Britain. And this, strangely but significantly, was also due to the fact that the Vatican feared Protestant England would not accord the honour of deanship of the diplomatic corps to the Pope's representative. Later, however, in 1938, the Vatican avoided the issue by appointing an apostolic delegate—a way out which it has employed not only with Protestant but also with non-Christian countries, e.g. Turkey.

When confronted with a country hostile to Catholicism, and determined not to receive or to send to the Vatican any special representative, the nuncio, or Papal delegate, must content himself, once his mission has failed, with appointing a high prelate of that country as his deputy. This deputy is instructed to contact the Vatican should important matters arise or should there be a change of heart in the government concerned.

In addition to these four principal diplomatic situations there are naturally many intermediate ones.

As regards the type of government that is hostile to the Catholic Church, it usually refuses to exchange official representatives, declares its right to deal with religious matters within its boundaries according to the laws of the country and without regard to the authority of the Catholic Church or her claims in social and political matters.

Such an attitude, being fundamentally hostile to all that the Church thinks right, automatically causes a state of conflict between the civil and religious authorities, which at times may

assume alarming proportions and upset the life of a whole nation. Of the two belligerents, the State at first seems to be the victor; for, being in control of its own machinery of suppression, it is able to enforce its will, at least on the surface. In most cases, however, this turns out to be anything but a victory, owing to the tactics of the Catholic Church, which gives way to force only so that she may continue to fight underground. Whenever this happens Catholic forces are thoroughly mobilized, usually to such an extent that the very foundations of the government are seriously undermined, and sometimes even made to crumble.

When a situation of this nature has been brought about, one or two kinds of war ensues: the war conducted by a *laissez faire* spirit or the war fought without asking for or giving any quarter.

The first, although waged relentlessly by both Church and government, usually concludes with a tacit but uncontracted *modus vivendi*, by which each limits itself to go so far but no farther in fighting the other. For instance, the State would not compel laws passed against the Catholic Church or in disharmony with her to be literally enacted, but would close its eyes to infringement of such laws, showing tolerance, and if enforcing them doing so only for the sake of appearances. The Church, on the other hand, would not order her local hierarchy, the Catholic Party, the minority of influential Catholic politicians, or the mass of devoted faithful entirely to boycott the State, but would advise them to tolerate its laws.

When this occurs, the Church and government, although in a chronic state of conflict, manage to get along without aggravating the situation unduly, hoping that time and circumstances might improve their relationship. But if that is rendered impossible, either because very important rights of the Church have been infringed or because the State does not consider it worth while to reach an uncontracted *modus vivendi*, then the powerful diplomatic and religious machinery of the Church is set to work, with a view to forcing the government to wiser counsel or to bringing about its downfall.

The pressure that Vatican diplomacy can exert upon individuals, political parties, and domestic and international issues

in any given country—whether friendly, neutral, or hostile, Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, or non-Christian—is immensely varied. It can assume countless shapes, can use the most disparate instruments, take advantage of the most common or the most exceptional circumstances, events, or problems. Indeed it is so flexible that it can be said, without fear of exaggeration, that there is no issue that it cannot influence, directly or indirectly, in diplomatic or political matters throughout the world, with particular regard to the West.

.

Issues apparently unconnected with religion or with the Catholic Church, after careful scrutiny, will frequently be found to have been affected by Vatican diplomacy. Questions seemingly of an essentially political or economic character are very often seriously influenced by the Vatican's adverse or friendly pressure. Certain historical events, which have altered the course of contemporary society, or have even forced great nations to adopt policies nefarious to the good relationship of races or continents, when examined, not rarely were originally provoked by the Vatican.

Vatican diplomacy, as the instrument of a hoary institution determined to conquer, will pursue policies spanning generations, and even the centuries. It will unhesitatingly lay a web of religious, diplomatic, and political intrigue, which it will use year after year, decade after decade, persistently, relentlessly, unscrupulously, regardless of set-backs, defeats, or the risk of marring the relationship of nations—indeed, unmindful even of provoking violent disorders, revolutions, or wars.

It will pursue the simplest and most obvious policies or the slyest and most secretive methods, the subtlest and most undetectable tactics, the most ruthless devices, or seemingly unworkable schemes. It will not hesitate to arrange for envoys to be secretly accredited to the Papal Court, by-passing the will of a nation; to wait half a century, to break the jealously kept tradition of a Protestant country; to oppose the entry into a war of another at one time, but to encourage the same country's intervention into another conflict, provided it fits into the general strategy; to employ the diplomats of other nations as Vatican agents; to blackmail simultaneously two great world

Powers to exert increasing pressure upon the head of a great nation, so as to influence its foreign policy, and thus to intervene in the conduct of another world conflict.

To circumvent the objections of any given country unwilling or hostile to the establishment of diplomatic relations, Vatican diplomacy will act in the slyest fashion—e.g. the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Vatican and England. Before the First World War the Vatican had pressed for the establishment of diplomatic relations with Great Britain. Political and religious opposition, particularly from the Church of England, however, became such a formidable obstacle that the scheme was momentarily shelved and half-forgotten.

Came the First World War, and with it a golden opportunity for the Vatican to resume its attack. Influential Catholic elements at the British Foreign Office were briefed. The sending of an envoy would be "provisional." The Vatican would not expect the British Government to recognize the Papal Court as a religious authority, but only as a diplomatic listening-post. In this fashion, the British Crown, in which the Church of England rested, would in no way be compromised.

The Foreign Office put the case to the British Government in this light and pressed for the establishment of relations. Fearing that Protestant England would not take the matter lightly, the Government hesitated. Thereupon, those few who were advocating the Vatican course took matters into their own hands. Some time in 1914, the British Foreign Office *secretly* sent an envoy to the Vatican. This was done, it should be noted, without consulting Parliament, testing public opinion, or giving any inkling of the status, duration, or power of the British envoy; a most blatant violation of the British Constitution.

As, however, the step taken could not be concealed for long, a declaration was issued, to the effect that the appointment was only for the duration of the war. This was a false statement, as subsequent facts proved. The disclosure came like a thunderbolt, and the shock caused by this diplomatic *fait accompli* was not confined to England. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa made the most serious protests, considering the appointment a breach of the Act of Settlement.

The appointment "for the duration" has remained ever since, and is now an accepted and established feature of the British Foreign Office.

Parallel tactics were used with another Protestant country, the U.S.A., where the Separation of Church and State, being one of the fundamental bases of the Constitution, makes it legally impossible for the American Government and the Vatican to exchange regular "official" diplomatic representatives.

In this case the appointment of an American ambassador to the Vatican was based on an "illegal subterfuge" which had created a "precedent," i.e. the necessity of the moment—namely, the outbreak of the Second World War.

Contrary to general belief, the U.S.A. was represented at the Vatican by a consul for over seventy years after the establishment of the United States. It was not, however, a diplomatic assignment, the consul having been appointed on the ground that his work consisted in developing trade with the Papal States.

A precedent having been created, the Vatican cautiously, but persistently, asked that a full legation be established. And in 1848, despite considerable opposition, the American Government consented. Protestant opinion set to work, until finally the House stopped its appropriation. The legation was withdrawn in 1867.

Relations with the Vatican were renewed by President Theodore Roosevelt, who sent William Howard Taft to Rome as his special representative to negotiate on problems arising from the American acquisition of the Philippine Islands. The pretext was that a political problem like that of the Philippines required a diplomatic instrument—i.e. an American diplomat. and Theodore Roosevelt by-passed the constitutional obstacles by sending W. H. Taft to Rome as his special representative.

A few years before the outbreak of the Second World War the Vatican pressed once more for an exchange of diplomatic representatives. One of its first successes was attained in 1933, when the Vatican appointed an apostolic delegate in Washington, whose position was non-diplomatic and whose work was officially confined to ecclesiastical matters. A few years later

the Vatican took a further step, and in 1936 sent Eugenio Pacelli to visit President Roosevelt.

In 1939 President Roosevelt appointed Myron Taylor as his personal representative to the Pope. Precedent for the Taylor mission rested in the Taft assignment. The technical difficulty which stood in the way of such an appointment—that is to say, that the plan had to be submitted to Congress, which alone had the power to grant the necessary financial funds for the maintenance of a legation—was by-passed simply by not asking Congress for the necessary funds. Mr. Taylor, being a millionaire, paid his own expenses, and hence the question of asking Congress for an appropriation was avoided. The appointment, therefore, was made over the heads of Congress; in other words, over the heads of the people of the United States.

Mr. Taylor held the rank of ambassador, but without any treaty-making or other powers normally held by ambassadors. In the Vatican's official listing of diplomats the American President's personal representative was at the bottom of the list of ambassadors, with a black line separating his name from the others. Yet no representative of a foreign power held so prominent a status at the Vatican as did Mr. Taylor while his post lasted. During his ten years' assignment to the Vatican he made seven separate trips to the Holy See for President Roosevelt and six for President Truman. No envoy was more frequently received in private audience by the Pope.

The U.S.A. had sent an "unofficial envoy" to the Vatican "for the duration." The Second World War ended in 1945, but the American envoy remained for almost another five years. It was only after growing representations by American public opinion that his mission ended in 1950.

Not long afterwards, however, President Truman astonished America by unexpectedly announcing the appointment of a fully fledged American ambassador to the Vatican (October 21, 1951), thus openly violating the American Constitution. The appointment had to be cancelled.

The precedent having been created, Vatican diplomacy had thus achieved its ultimate aim.

The same tactics were used with other countries—e.g.

France, which, like England, during the First World War, had sent an envoy to the Vatican "for the duration." Like his British colleague, the French representative has remained there ever since.

In the U.S.A. Vatican diplomacy works mainly via non-diplomatic instruments to further its diplomatic interests, two of these non-diplomatic instruments being the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the *de facto* head of the American hierarchy, the Cardinal of New York.

In 1919 a hundred American bishops set up the N.C.W.C., "to unify, co-ordinate, and organize American Catholics in various groups of activities." The Vatican, in the absence of normal diplomatic intercourse, has made ample use of the Conference to achieve objectives ranging from pressing the Federal Government on certain legislation, to making representations to the State Department on behalf of Catholic interests abroad—e.g. in Mexico—or of threatened missionaries in Red China, or in favour of a cardinal in some country behind the Iron Curtain, and of a thousand and one other issues, many of which we shall examine later.

Since the Second World War the Cardinal of New York has become the official "Grey Eminence" of Vatican diplomacy, with more than considerable influence both in Rome and in Washington. This is due, not only to the fact that the U.S.A. has become the leading country of the West, but also to that other seldom-mentioned one, that the Vatican, like most European States, has become increasingly dependent upon the money coming from the U.S.A. Money generally dictates policy. This is as true of the Vatican as it is of any other political body in the world. That the Vatican has always been highly sensitive to the inflow of gold was recognized long ago by enemies and friends alike. Spain, whose Catholicity has never been in doubt, went so far as to coin a saying in connexion with it: *El dinero es muy Catolico* ("Money is very Catholic"). Vatican diplomacy has never disregarded the power bought and brought by money. Hence, the U.S.A. being the wealthiest country in the world, with more than half the world's gold reserve in her vaults, it followed that the status of the American hierarchy increased proportionately to the increase in the financial might of the

American people. A characteristic, this, which played no mean role in an institution claiming to be concerned only with the problems of a future life.

Vatican diplomacy can act very slyly to break a tradition, particularly a Protestant one. Its main tactics here consist of repeated, persistent attack upon whatever has yielded once, on the assumption that, if it yields a second or a third time, resistance is ultimately bound to be broken. Once embarked upon it, its efforts will continue unabated for years, decades, or longer.

A King or a Queen of Britain is the supreme head of the Church of England. As such they cannot visit, recognize, or pay obeisance in any form to the Pope. That, in addition to being an established Protestant tradition, is also made legal by the Statute, Constitution, and Laws of both Church and State. These Laws have been jealously guarded for generations, as symbolizing the complete independence of a Protestant country from the Papacy. The breaking of such a tradition, consequently, would imply that a Protestant country recognized the moral authority of the Papacy, and, indeed, even if tacitly, the religious supremacy of Catholicism over Protestantism.

Employing the tactics of discreet religious-diplomatic intrigue via the Foreign Office, after years of secretive manœuvring, the Vatican at long last succeeded in its first important step. In 1903 King Edward VII visited the Pope. This was a flagrant breach of the Act of Settlement. The British public and the Church of England were kept completely in the dark about the whole affair, and news of the royal visit was released only after the event had taken place. To appease an incensed public opinion, both the Foreign Office and the Vatican hastened to say that the visit had no significance whatsoever, that it was a merely personal affair of the King, and that in any case it was regarded as an exceptional event which would not be repeated.

But the precedent had been created, and this helped not inconsiderably in preparing the way for posting the British envoy to the Vatican in subsequent years.

The "exceptional event," however, was repeated, and in 1918 the Prince of Wales, the heir to the British throne, went

to the Vatican. This was followed by an even more important visit, that of the King and Queen of England themselves, in 1923. As on the first occasion, great secrecy surrounded the whole affair, and the news of the royal breaking of the Statute of the land was released, again, after the event had taken place, and consequently when it was too late to do anything apart from protest.

Following the Royal example, rarely at first but increasingly frequently with the passing of the years, high personages began to pay discreet visits to the Vatican, until a generation later delegations from the House of Lords paid public and official visits to the Pope. British Cabinet Ministers and, indeed, even Prime Ministers went to the Vatican to discuss political and religious problems with the head of Catholicism. This was not all. Members of the Royal Family were seen again in the Vatican halls. In 1949 Princess Margaret, attired in black, was officially received in audience by Pope Pius XII. By this time, the public had become accustomed enough to see important British individuals go to the Vatican, and hence the Royal visit went by wholly unchallenged, the furore of a few years before being totally absent.

Two years later, on April 13, 1951, the heir to the British Throne and future Head of the Protestant Church of England, accompanied by her husband, was received in private audience by the Pope. The event needed no longer to be hushed up; previous to its taking place it was publicized far and wide throughout the world, and articles, pictures, and films were printed and shown everywhere. The Princess had half an hour with the Pope, who gave her an artistic image, and to her husband a large gold medal commemorating the first year of his Pontificate. They were then received by the Under-Secretary of State for the Vatican and by other important ecclesiastical personages. This time the visit was accepted almost as a matter of course by all except the Free Church of Scotland, which dared to come out openly against it in the old manner:

The tendency of the younger members of the Royal Family in recent days to go out of their way to visit the Vatican and do obeisance to the head of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy is occasioning much distress to many of His Majesty's most loyal Protestant subjects [it said]. It is

not only that the two Princesses have sought an audience with the Pope, but that they have done it with an ostentatious publicity that seemed determined to flout Protestant opinion in the nation.

The adoption by the Princess of the habit, black dress and veil, incumbent on Roman Catholic women when having an audience with the Pope, added just that note of surrender to Roman Catholic conditions of acceptance that are so dear to the heart of the Roman Catholic Church and so humiliating to loyal Protestants.

We know fully well that the official "advisers" to their Royal Highnesses must bear a great deal of the responsibility for all this, and we know that our Foreign Office is riddled with Roman Catholic sentiment and diplomacy. . . .¹

General Protestant opinion, however, did not follow this line. Indeed, Protestant voices were heard defending the Royal visit to the Pope. A Presbyterian Church leader's comment concerning the Scottish Church's attack was simple: "They were only doing in Rome as the Romans do." That was not all. English Catholic hierarchies, referring to the isolated Protestant objection, took offence that Protestants should become concerned because the future Head of their Church had paid homage to the Pope, and loudly complained that Protestants were insulting Catholicism by daring to publicly utter these uncalled-for and insulting remarks (of the Free Church of Scotland).² The following year Princess Elizabeth became Queen of England (February, 1952). Vatican diplomacy had travelled far indeed since the first Royal visit in 1903.

Vatican diplomacy will act seemingly contradictorily without blushing, disdainful of the morality of the issues at stake. Before the First World War Italy had signed a pact with Germany and Austria-Hungary by virtue of which she bound herself to enter on their side in case of hostilities. The Vatican, for reasons we shall discuss later, favoured Germany and Austria. When the war broke out Italy, after some hesitation, sided with the Allies—i.e. France and Britain. One of the main obstacles to such a decision was the Vatican, which exerted all its pressure to have Italy side with Germany. During the period of Italy's neutrality this pressure was used to prevent her from entering into the war. After she had sided with the Allies, the Vatican promoted such a defeatist Catholic hostility that it managed to disrupt the civil and even the military morale of the country, and to such an extent that it became

one of the main causes, even if an indirect one, of the greatest military defeat suffered by Italy, when the retreat of Caporetto (1917) endangered the prospect of final victory for the Allies.

One of the Vatican's accusations against Italy at this period was that she had sided with the democracies, the begetters of a "democratic godless civilization" which "had promised freedom and has made the nations slaves to oppressive militarism; had promised happiness and has brought slaughter among nations" (*Civiltà Cattolica*, May, 1915).

When finally the tide turned and the Allies emerged victorious, the Vatican simply sided with them.

During the Second World War, when Mussolini joined with Hitler, the Vatican, while officially neutral, gave its full support to the Fascist adventure by using the Catholic Church as a mighty propaganda machine, appealing to the Italian youth "to carry out their duties with the loyalty proper to citizens and soldiers, and thus give proof of heroism in its task of assuring prosperity to this nation, the centre of Catholic Faith and of civilization" ³ (*Civiltà Cattolica*, July 15, 1940). Incitement by the Catholic Church to fight against the Western Democracies was not confined to the Press. It was part and parcel of the Catholic hierarchy, who supported the Fascist war to the hilt.

Once the Fascist armies began to retreat, however, the enthusiasm of the Catholic Church in Italy began to cool off, until it gradually rose again, towards the end of the war, no longer for the fallen Mussolini or the doomed Hitler, but for the victorious Allies, whose troops, on entering Rome, were received by the Pope, who blessed them in all solemnity as the liberators of the Catholic Church, so badly persecuted by the Fascist and Nazi tyrannies.

Among the characteristics of the Vatican is not only its brazen opportunism, but its unscrupulous employment of diplomatic instruments and religion to serve its political schemes—for instance, by using a Catholic diplomat, representing a foreign Power, accredited to a country which has cut off diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

The case of Rumania is typical. In 1950 the Rumanian Government discovered a vast espionage net in which various

foreign Powers were involved. One of these was the Vatican, which had worked hand-in-hand with the American and French Intelligence services. The Vatican's co-operation had been given mostly by its unrivalled ecclesiastical organization, which had charged the Catholic clergy of the country with the task of collecting information of a political, economic, and even military nature within their parishes or dioceses. Such information, while *per se* not of intrinsic military value, became so once it was supplemented by that of the American and French Intelligences.

The Rumanian Government, having collected irrefutable proof that the Vatican Nunciature in Bucharest had been engaged in such activities as already mentioned, closed the Nunciature⁴ and expelled the Papal Nuncio—who, significantly enough, was an American, in close touch with the American State Department.

The ejection of the Papal Nuncio from Rumania meant not only that the Vatican had no longer any direct diplomatic contact with that country, but also that all direct communication with the Communist countries behind the Iron Curtain ceased, the Papal Nuncio in Bucharest being the last Papal envoy behind the Iron Curtain. It seemed as if Vatican diplomacy's channels of information had been very badly blocked, indeed paralysed.

But not for long. Ways and means by which to re-enter the country were soon found, and close co-operation with another capital soon yielded obvious results.

The British Minister in Rumania was recalled and a new one appointed. The latter—and this was by no means a coincidence—was a devout Catholic. And, what is even more significant, he succeeded a predecessor who not only had been in the closest touch with the expelled Papal Nuncio, but who now was appointed British Minister to the Holy See.

Catholics are in duty bound to further the interests of their Church. Catholic diplomats, therefore, must help Catholic diplomacy. A Catholic diplomat, filling an exceptional diplomatic post, from which the representative of his Church has been excluded, must act in his triple capacity as the representative of his government, as a Catholic, and as a Catholic diplomat, employed by a lay government, but conscience

bound to act also and simultaneously as an unofficial diplomat for the Catholic Church.

Vatican diplomacy, expelled from the main entrance, had re-entered through the back door.

This type of diplomatic "camouflage" is relatively common, and comparatively innocuous. Religion at the service of Vatican diplomacy, however, can be employed to play far more sinister roles—for instance, to co-operate in, or even to organize, proper espionage, sabotage, or guerilla warfare. We shall have ample opportunity to see how this is done. Suffice it here to state that it is not confined to the West. Vatican diplomacy can work hand-in-hand with non-Christian countries or non-Christian regimes to further the secular interests upon whose success depends the furtherance of Catholic schemes.

Thus, after China became Communist, the ousted Chiang Kai Shek found ready collaborators in Chinese and even Western Catholics in China, who, under cover of religious activities, acted as his agents.

A typical case was that connected with the arrests in Tientsin, when nineteen persons were charged with espionage activities, carried out "under the camouflage of the Catholic Church." The arrested agents of the Chinese Intelligence Service were members of the "Peiping-Tientsin underground column of the Catholic Youth Loyalty Corps" and of the "Tientsin branch of the People's National Construction Association."⁵

These activities were an integral part of the grand design of Vatican diplomacy in the Far East, directed at sustaining any movement combating Communism. While serving Vatican diplomacy's immediate wants, they did immense harm to Christianity, which was thus naturally identified with unpopular regimes. Chinese Catholics who saw this danger dared to defy the Vatican on political grounds and, supported by Chinese and Western Protestants, recommended "severe punishment" for those "abusing religion" in this manner.⁶ Catholic hierarchs entrenched in Formosa with Chiang Kai Shek protested at such audacity, declaring that the Reds had renewed their fury against religion. Proof? The Tientsin Catholic "martyrs."

This purposeful distortion of facts is part and parcel of Vatican diplomacy, and is far more important than is generally realized. Distortion, when done simultaneously with pressure upon public opinion, is used very frequently by Catholic diplomacy to influence paramount political problems. Instances of this type of Catholic see-saw technique are countless. Suffice the following.

Prior to the entry of the United States into the Second World War Vatican main concern was that European Fascism be not defeated. American aid to the Western democracies fighting Fascism could annul Fascist military superiority. Hence it became essential that such aid be withheld. What did Vatican diplomacy do to achieve this? It mobilized the American hierarchy. A tremendous campaign advocating Isolationism was initiated, or rather renewed, sponsored, promoted, and supported, by practically the entire American Catholic Church, which in no time surpassed all the most rabid Isolationists and indeed became one of their most powerful instruments.

The campaign had three main objectives: a long-range one, to prevent the U.S.A. from entering the war on the side of the Allies; and two short-range ones, (*a*) to slow down American rearmament, and (*b*) to prevent the Lend-Lease Act of assistance to England and other democracies from being put into effect.

This campaign, initiated before the Second World War and intensified after its outbreak, reached its highest pitch when Soviet Russia was brought into the fight by Hitler's attack (June, 1941). Isolationism, led by the American hierarchy, was now given another propaganda gun to fire: It would be sheer folly to help European Democracies, it said, for by helping them America would help Soviet Russia. Therefore let Europe fight its own war. Meaning, let the Fascist dictatorships win. "Nations which call Russia a friend cannot say that they are fighting for the Kingdom of God," declared at this stage Mgr. Sheen. Cardinal O'Connell put it more succinctly: "The war is not our affair," he said; "let those who have started it, finish it." Bishop Cassidy of Fall River put it even more bluntly: "The best way to protect democracy is not by putting Hitler out of business," he declared, "but . . . by eradicating materialism here in this country."

But the most violent Catholic spokesman of all was undoubtedly Father Coughlin, the most outstanding exponent of American-Catholic Fascism. Father Coughlin was the "unofficial" spokesman of the Vatican at this period. He was one of the various instruments of the indirect exertions of Vatican diplomacy; the extreme Right Wing of American Catholicism, intimately identified with what was most reactionary in the country. He served the Vatican as a rabble-rouser, as a violent moulder of the most politically and emotionally unbalanced section of American public opinion, and hence as a dangerous element, capable of seriously embarrassing the Administration.

Father Coughlin was particularly useful to the Vatican, because he gave effective violent leadership, particularly to the Irish-American cross-sections which constitute a potent political force in some of the larger metropolitan areas. His speeches, radio broadcasts, and sundry subversive organizations such as the Christian Front became the most rabid exponents of the cause of extreme Isolationism.

"Like thieves who operate under the cover of night," wrote Father Coughlin in his journal, *Social Justice*, in May, 1940,

there are in our midst those who operate beneath the cloak of protected auspices to steal our liberty. The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies is a high-sounding name, composed of high-handed gentlemen who are leaving no stone unturned to throw everything precious to an American to the dogs of war . . . sneakingly, subversively and un-Americanly, hiding behind a sanctimonious stuffed shirt . . . these men form the most dangerous fifth column that ever set foot upon neutral soil. They are the Quislings of America, they are the Judas Iscariots within the apostolic college of our nation. They are the gold-protected, Government-protected snakes in the grass who dare not stand upright and speak like men face to face.⁷

The Vatican's is one of the most cynical diplomacies in the world. To achieve its objectives it will not even hesitate to march under the same banner as the enemies it wants to destroy. Thus, at one critical stage of this campaign—i.e. prior to the entry of Russia into the war—the extraordinary spectacle was seen of the mass of American Catholics marching together with the American Communists, who before Hitler's attack upon Soviet Russia (1941) had formed one of the noisiest

Isolationist groups in America. Previous to that date, American Isolationism, mightily strengthened by the Catholic Church, saw American Catholics arm-in-arm with Italian Fascists, German Nazis, Protestant ministers, Irish Catholics, disgruntled Democrats, rob-ribbed Republicans, Jesuits, and Communists, all determined to keep America out of the European imperialistic war.

Not all Catholics, however, followed the official line of the American hierarchy. Isolated Catholic voices were heard to speak against this mighty surge of American and Catholic pro-Nazism. Bishop J. Hurley, of St. Augustine, Florida, was one of them. Summing up the tactics of American Catholicism at this critical period, the bishop, in fact, did not hesitate to declare:

I deeply regret to say that many good Americans, amongst them Catholic publicists, are now following the Berlin party line.⁸

The Isolationists' ranks were scattered by the bombshell of Hitler's invasion of Russia. Whereas the American Communists became overnight ardent interventionists, the Catholics increased the ferociousness of their Isolationist efforts. Hitler had to be helped at all costs in his efforts to destroy the chief enemy of the Catholic Church. This could be done by keeping America out of the war. Had they held on for a while, he would have annihilated Soviet Russia within a few months became their main argument. Pope Pius XII was certain of this. Not owing to any supernatural disclosure, but mostly to official information coming simultaneously from Berlin, Washington, and London. Hitler's Foreign Minister, Ribbentrop, was sure that "the Russia of Stalin will be erased from the map within eight weeks."⁹

The British military and political leaders, with the sublime smugness of extinct dodos, pontificated that Ribbentrop was wrong. "Russia would collapse within a month," they said. Some, the most pessimistic—supported by the American State Department—prophesied that Hitler could be unlucky. "He might give the *coup de grâce* to the Soviet monster, not within one, but within a possible maximum of three months," they declared.¹⁰

The Vatican's dream, the destruction of Soviet Russia, at

last was in sight. Twenty years of strenuous effort to achieve this must not be nullified at this stage by the intervention of America, or by American help to Russia. The American hierarchy received precise orders to bring the Isolationist campaign to heat stage. This was soon intensified to such an extent that President Roosevelt himself was no longer able to stand its devastating propaganda.

The Vatican policy had begun to seriously endanger his policy of helping the European Democracies. Roosevelt did not, it should be noted, try to come to terms with the leaders of the American Catholic hierarchy, knowing these to be nothing but the political dummies of the Vatican. He decided to take drastic steps, and at the very source of the inspiration of such vicious pressure sent his personal representative to see the Pope. The task of the President's envoy: to persuade Pius XII that it was in the interests of the U.S.A. to help the European Democracies, and hence Soviet Russia, lest the whole of the European continent became an impregnable Fascist fortress. Catholic pressure against the Administration, therefore, had to stop, as it was making it increasingly difficult for the American Government to implement its policy.

The Pope, who had vast long-range designs in connexion with the Catholic Church within the U.S.A., in the Western Hemisphere, and within both in relation to the world at large, could not wholly disregard Roosevelt's request. On the other hand he could not permit America to help Soviet Russia via help to the Democracies, and even less to let her dispatch war material. The latter consideration prevailed, and the Pope replied to the President with a resounding No. The negative answer, however, had to be couched in such a way as to transform it into a positive factor, useful to the Vatican, the American Catholics, and all those religious and lay forces opposed to giving help to Russia.

How was such a political contortion to be made? It was accomplished in the Vatican's classical fashion. The whole issue, from the essentially political field, was shifted to the slippery one of religion, where Roosevelt's whole plea was nullified. The Catholic Church could not remain neutral or, even worse, help a country which did not allow complete religious freedom was the Vatican's reply. In Soviet Russia

religion was persecuted; hence the Catholic Church could not order American Catholics to stop their campaign against the Administration engaged in helping the Russian enemies of God.

Thanks to such reply, Vatican diplomacy had not only evaded Roosevelt's request, it had used its negative reply to put the President politically "on the spot," to justify its conduct against him, and even to make further allies in the non-Catholic ranks opposed, like Catholicism, to aid to Russia.

The impudence of this move could not have been more blatant, for only a few years before the Pope had had to write no less than two encyclicals, one against Mussolini and the other against Hitler, complaining that they persecuted the Catholic Church.¹¹ This, however, was not all. At the same period when Pius XII was replying in this manner to Roosevelt, Protestant chapels in Franco's Catholic Spain were being attacked, looted, and burnt, while Protestant Bibles were wantonly destroyed, over 100,000 copies in one single blow.¹²

President Roosevelt, although aware that the Papal answer was only an excuse to justify the Catholic pro-Hitler campaign, nonetheless took the Pope at his word, and sent an American mission to Moscow, headed by Averell Harriman, who was instructed to take up the question of religious freedom in Russia with the Soviet Government.¹³

The Soviet replied simply by quoting Article 24 of the Soviet Constitution, which guarantees religious freedom for all, adding that this sufficiently covered the demands made by the United States.¹⁴

This manœuvre of Vatican diplomacy, although seemingly clear for all to see, was aimed simultaneously at several objectives, almost all contradicting one another, but cleverly calculated in advance to fit a long-range strategical jig-saw puzzle. It proposed that help to Russia be conditioned by the Soviet surrender to the American demand for religious freedom. This was not only an excuse for not abating Catholic opposition to Roosevelt; it was a genuine demand. What was not genuine about it was that the Vatican wanted a special assurance of complete religious freedom to be given specifically to the Catholic Church, and to no one else. This owing to one capital reason: that the Vatican's long-range policy was

nothing less than the conversion of Russia to Catholicism, as we shall presently see. It was Fatima in action. The Vatican, while pursuing diametrically opposite goals, by its use of Isolationism and its negative reply to Roosevelt, could not help taking full advantage of such a golden opportunity to blackmail two countries: the Soviet Government into giving a formal assurance that religious freedom would be maintained, lest American war material be withheld, and the American Government into forcing the Soviets to give such a guarantee as the price of American help.

This, while at the same time its objective was indirect help to Hitler, by preventing American help for Russia. Which meant that to deny assistance to the Soviets under the pretext of religious differences would help Hitler to win the war, Russia to lose it, and the Democracies—those “horrible fetishes” of the Western world—to go under.

Then, on December 7, 1941, came the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour and the subsequent declaration of war on the United States by Hitler and Mussolini.

For a moment American Catholicism was stunned. Then it found its feet again and became interventionist, as befitted the unscrupulousness of Vatican diplomacy, which, by permitting the American Church to somersault once more, riding on the crest of an outraged American patriotism, formulated another plan, to ensure its future in case the war should not end as it envisaged at this period.

The entry into the Second World War of Japan and the U.S.A. altered the Vatican's world strategy. Vatican diplomacy, however, had not been caught unawares. And, having made the necessary readjustment to the transformed situation, it continued as ever on its crooked way, until at the end of the conflict it emerged as an ally and, indeed, as a full-blooded partner of the U.S.A.

The exertions of Vatican diplomacy consequently, owing to the fact that they are so multifariously diverse and have behind them the intangible might of religion and the colossal administration of a world-wide Church, can affect small and big issues of local and global dimensions. Hence no political movement, ideology, Church, nation, or continent can afford to disregard them as of no importance.

The few instances of its working just given, although typical, do not tell the whole story. For the Vatican is not only a diplomatic Power with political ambitions; it is a political Power with immense religious objectives, for the attainment of which it will unhesitatingly employ diplomacy and politics, ideological animosity, religious differences, national and racial odium.

The main characteristic of Vatican diplomacy in the last decades of the first half of the twentieth century has been its enmity of Communism and Soviet Russia. Hence, to many, Vatican diplomacy is an instrument employed to fight the greatest evil which threatens contemporary society. This is not only an illusion purposefully cultivated by the Vatican; it is a most dangerous fallacy. For Vatican diplomacy has pursued the same kind of war that it is at present pursuing against Communism, against other ideologies, and even religions. Communism is only its latest enemy No. 1. Before Communism was even heard of, Vatican diplomacy was busy mobilizing the world with the same hatred, using the same diplomatic tricks and religious and political slogans as it does now, against Protestantism at one time, against Secularism at another, against the Orthodox Church, against Liberalism, and against Democracy.

Liberalism and Democracy in the last century, as already stated, were to the Vatican precisely what Socialism and Communism have become in the twentieth. We shall soon see how Vatican diplomacy conducted a war against them which for its unscrupulousness has nothing to envy the one it is now waging against Communism.

The reason which makes the Vatican wage such uncompromising wars is not only that it wants to destroy an enemy of religion, but that in its religious or ideological enemies it sees its potential rivals to world domination. The more potentially capable they are of dominating society, the fiercer the Vatican's war against them.

Vatican diplomatic exertions, in spite of changes of times, names, places, and opponents, are always the same. Vatican goals remain always the same, its ultimate one being the main objective of all its short- and long-range deeds.

Owing to this, Vatican activities can be recognized in any

age, in any place, against any enemy, under any camouflage, whether screened by political or religious screens, as the unmistakable activities of a most sinister Power, scheming for the thwarting of the freedom of men.

They can be directed against a rival Church, like the Orthodox Church, or burst out against Protestantism, or even against non-Christian nations, with a view to conquering them.

Vatican long-range diplomacy can cause a local commotion to put pressure upon a distant central government, as it did with Spain, and the riots of Mexico City in the seventeenth century; or sacrifice a ruler it originally supported, e.g. the Emperor Maximilian, or to help in bringing about the downfall of one of the most liberal monarchies of modern times, e.g. in Brazil in the nineteenth.

It will not hesitate to blackmail a government, as it did France, in the issue of Alsace-Lorraine; or to compel a nation to remain neutral during a world war, as it did with Portugal in the case of Timor Island; or to force a people to co-operate with an aggressor, e.g. during the Japanese occupation of the Philippine Islands in the Second World War.

It will not hesitate to bring about the downfall of a democratic government, as it did in France; to work for the unseating of a dictator whom it had supported for over twenty years, as it did Mussolini; to scheme for the substitution of another by one of his lieutenants, or actually to participate, by remote control, in an attempt to assassinate him, as it did with Hitler.

To undermine, weaken, and possibly destroy democracy, the Vatican will not hesitate to make use of the most important instrument of a democratic administration, elections; to befoul or cheat the will of the people by putting heavy religious, diplomatic, or political pressure upon the electors; to support friendly rulers, friendly governments, friendly dictators.

To do this it will directly advise the electors to vote in a given way, as it did in the Saar; or it will dissolve a political party to pave the way to a dictatorship, as it did in Italy; or to sway another in a given direction, so as to help a most ruthless tyranny to be installed over a great people, as it did with Hitler. To confuse the electors, the Vatican will not hesitate to resort to the most hypocritical devices, as it did in the case of the Rhineland, of Italy's Fascist oath, of Japan's Emperor-

worship laws. To swing elections in the direction desired it will openly blackmail, via religious pressure, a whole Catholic nation, as it did in the Italian general election of 1948.

To flout the will of the people it will advise an unpopular king to remain, as it did King Victor Emmanuel; another to resist the verdict of a nation, as it did King Umberto; and a third, to provoke almost a revolution, as it did King Leopold of Belgium.

It will not hesitate to plot with an aggressor for the annexation of a whole country by another, as it did with Austria; to disrupt a republic, as in the case of Czechoslovakia; or to help in the military defeat of a great European nation, as it did with France.

To mobilize the Church of a whole country against its own government, screening a purely political enmity with the mantle of religion, as it did in Poland; to organize one of the most widespread international diplomatic plots, as it did in Hungary with Cardinal Mindszenty; or to inspire perhaps the most loathsome religious massacre of the twentieth century, as it did in Croatia.

To reinstate its political rule over countries subject to Protestant, Liberal, or Republican governments, Vatican diplomacy will not hesitate to be privy to a national insurrection, as it did in Ireland; of a bloody revolution, as it did in Mexico; and directly to provoke one of the most bloody civil wars, as it did in Spain.

To further its long-range political strategy over the West, the Vatican did not hesitate to become one of the hidden inspiring causes which finally led to the outbreak of the First World War; to help in the nursing, growth, and strengthening of Fascism, and ultimately to side with Nazi Germany and Japan when it seemed as if they were going to stamp out the resistance of the democratic nations of the world, as it did during the Second World War; to foster one of the greatest hate crusades ever seen and to become one of the main inspirers of the feverish preparations for a third World War, as it did from the very end of the Second.

All this has been, or is being, accomplished by diplomacy, which is "held in high esteem by the Church, which possesses a special talent for transmitting this art to its envoys," as an

Under-Secretary of State at the Vatican rightly declared. Whether the supposition that "were Catholic diplomacy to come to an end, the world of diplomacy would be deprived of an exemplary model" ¹⁵ is correct or not will be left to the reader to judge.

Meanwhile, the reality is that what has just been indicated is not based on mere speculation. It is an integral part of the history of our contemporary world.

Are these the wild, unfounded accusations so frequently cast against an institution like the Catholic Church, which, because of her power and success, has created so much envy, fear, and antagonism, and which is so often heard advocating the peaceful settlement of disputes between classes, States, and ideologies—indeed, which has so distinguished herself in her advice to the nations to preserve world peace?

Or are these facts concretized by the unscrupulous, premeditated exertions of an institution hiding behind the cloak of religion, talking of peace but in reality preparing for war, and everlastingly busy in waging a relentless one against the freedom of the individual and of nations, with a view to its final, complete, and absolute dominion over the entire world?

The fairest reply is to let the Vatican's deeds speak for themselves.

13

DEADLINESS OF VATICAN DIPLOMACY IN PEACE

THE FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVE OF Vatican diplomacy, as we have already seen, is the furtherance of the dominion of the Catholic Church. To achieve this schemes of all kinds are conceived, executed, discarded, resumed, disguised under diverse names at different periods, according to the stability or fluidity of national and international affairs or to various other factors, few of which escape the scrutiny of so ancient and cunning a diplomacy as that of the Vatican.

Vatican diplomacy does not necessarily always spring to the fore attired in orthodox diplomatic garb. As a rule, it hides behind secular instruments. Only in exceptional cases does it overtly follow a given course, with a view to creating a favourable habitat.

The Vatican accepts disasters provided it can supplant old schemes with new ones. In spite of this, however, it never abandons its original failed policies, no matter how far they have been relegated to the political backwaters. And at the first favourable opportunity they will be resumed, substantially in their entirety, though slightly modified or under a different name.

The methods, shades of slyness, schemes used by Vatican

diplomacy are countless. Notwithstanding their immense variety, one theme, however, emerges stubbornly, persistently, and indefatigably: the furtherance of Catholic power everywhere and above all.

Concrete examples are more eloquent than theoretical elucidations. We shall now examine the working of Vatican diplomacy during almost three decades—i.e. from the end of the First World War until the end of the Second, glancing at some of its most typical instances.

During this period Vatican diplomacy had ample scope to operate many of its diplomatic guiles, ranging from influencing the elections of democracies and dictatorships alike to plotting against dictators to precipitate their downfall.

Elections, as already seen, can easily be influenced by the religious pressure of the Catholic Church, whether they are local or national, and more often than not they are used by the Vatican as powerful instruments through which to exert its pressure upon parties, governments, and nations, often altering the course of events to a degree seldom realized by either friends or opponents. The methods employed vary according to circumstances and the goal at stake. Elections are not necessarily held to elect a government and are not always democratic. They can be exploited to enhance nationalism, an ideology, a regime, to give lustre to a dictator, and for many other similar purposes. But, whatever their nature, goal, or purpose, one thing is certain: the Vatican will never allow a single one to take place without trying to exploit it through political, religious, or diplomatic pressure, or all three simultaneously.

As a rule, the Vatican interferes in elections to support a friendly party or government, to stultify a hostile ideology or coalition, or to put enough pressure upon either of these for them to carry out a given policy.

Such were the nature and purpose of the Vatican's interference in the Saar elections. The Saar elections or plebiscite were held to bolster up the Nazi regime, not yet firmly in power. To promote more general support of himself, Hitler needed something which, by transcending party feelings, would mobilize the patriotism of all Germans. The Saar province, which had been under the administration of the

League of Nations for a number of years, gave him the ideal opportunity. In 1935 Hitler turned his eyes towards it with a view to reincorporation. The task, however, was not an easy one. For it was apparent that this desire of the people to be reunited with Germany, although strong, was not sufficient to neutralize the opposition to Nazism which had grown throughout the Saar, particularly since Hitler's bloody purges of the previous years, when there were sudden massacres of leading Nazis, among whom there were several Catholics.

But Hitler and the Vatican, although in the midst of a bitter quarrel, caused by the great question of who—the Nazi regime or the Catholic Church—should have the complete monopoly of education, knew also that the success of their own schemes depended upon mutual support. [The Vatican had complained that Hitler had not respected the concordat which he had signed with the Vatican in 1933. In the Saar scheme the Vatican saw an opportunity to ask him to comply with the agreement. The Vatican would tell Saar Catholics to support Hitler's plebiscite—i.e. to vote for incorporation into Nazi Germany—provided Hitler gave a solemn pledge to respect the concordat. Hitler promptly consented. The Catholic hierarchy of the Saar, who until then had used caution in their directives to the faithful, were instructed by the Vatican to give full support to the plebiscite. The Catholics voted, and voted as instructed. The Nazis obtained ninety-two per cent of the votes in support of their plan. Result: the Saar was reincorporated. Hitler had scored his first, badly needed, national-international triumph, the first of the many which were to lead him, with increasing boldness, towards the Second World War.]

The exertions of Vatican diplomacy-cum-Catholic Church are confined neither to influencing elections or political parties nor to the support of tyrants. They can take direct advantage, with equal skill and lack of principle, of situations, events, weaknesses of nations, and, indeed, of anything that can be used to exert pressure and threats in order to attain Catholic aims.

For instance, it can profit by some abnormal internal situa-

tion, to extort, by the technique of religious-political blackmail, concessions to which the Catholic Church is not entitled.

A typical instance of this technique was when it was used in connexion with Alsace-Lorraine. Here it consisted in Vatican diplomacy exerting relentless pressure upon the weak side of nationalism, to a greater degree and in a more direct way than in even the Saar example.

When the Conference of Versailles, after the First World War, tried to readjust the changed map of Europe, it soon found that one of its thorniest problems was Alsace-Lorraine. The reincorporation of these provinces into France, however, had become also an increasing source of anxiety to the Republic itself, owing to the fact that the annexed territory seemed not at all disposed to settle down easily under French rule. This was a very delicate situation, as at that period, national susceptibilities being what they were, the reincorporation of Alsace-Lorraine had been transformed into a matter of paramount French prestige and French national pride.

One of the principal characteristics of Alsace-Lorraine was that it was solidly Catholic. It was thanks to this that Vatican diplomacy could soon make itself felt in the following manner: while the unrest grew, both in the recovered provinces and in Paris, the Vatican, which had followed events with the greatest interest, made it known that if "the French Government had shown more understanding towards the situation of the Catholic Church in the Republic," it might have attempted to exert its "not inconsiderable influence upon Catholic Alsace-Lorraine for the establishment of a better understanding between the new province and the Republic."

This was the old policy of political blackmail, accomplished via the clergy or hierarchy of a local province, employed as a "spiritual *gendarmérie*," as Napoleon called it, with a view to forcing a given policy upon a whole nation. This Catholic strategy is, as a rule, carried out as follows: if a given province or nation whose population is Catholic, when newly annexed or occupied, becomes seditious, the Church invariably tries to strike a bargain with the annexing power. Pope Leo XIII followed this grand policy with Great Britain in respect of Ireland, with Germany in respect of Poland, with Austria in respect of the Croats, and in other instances.

Alsace-Lorraine fell into such a category, and this Vatican strategy was promptly put to work. It was operated with ability, and its promotion conducted according to rules. In 1919 Alsace-Lorraine began to stir dangerously against France, creating the most serious trouble. This became even more alarming when the two provinces sent a large group of deputies to Parliament. These were not only deputies. They were—and the first thing they did was to make this very clear—Catholic deputies: in fact, the most numerous Parliamentary deputation seen by the French Chamber since 1880.

The Catholic *bloc* began a co-ordinated and relentless agitation, threatening secession unless the French Government acceded to their requests—or, rather, to the Vatican's requests. For behind it all there had been, from the very beginning, the hand of Vatican diplomacy.

Within a short period the Catholic pressure had become so powerful that the Government, owing chiefly to the delicacy of the problems involved, finally had to give way. Negotiations were opened and a bargain struck. The Vatican undertook to keep the Catholic Alsatian rebels in check, provided, in return, the French Republic stopped its official hostility against the Church, abolished certain anti-Catholic laws, and granted other privileges deemed useful to the Catholic Church. The Republic, one of the least religious countries of Europe, whose population was mostly hostile to the influence of the Church and whose statesmen were all well-known anti-clericals, dropped the anti-Catholic ardour of former times. The most important laws inimical to the Church were repealed—or, when not repealed, were not enforced—and the religious orders, particularly the Jesuits, which had been expelled, returned.

That was not all. To complete its success, the Vatican pressed also for a diplomatic triumph. It insisted that the French Republic, whose paramount policy was absolute Separation of Church and State, should be permanently represented at the Vatican and should receive a nuncio in Paris. Result: the Republic, denounced by the Catholic Church for more than forty years as that cursed "Republic of Atheists, Jews, Freemasons, and Liberals," and against which she had mobilized all her religious and political forces in vain attempts to bring about its downfall, now appointed an ambassador at

the Papal Court and welcomed a Papal Nuncio in Paris. A few years later a French Minister visited the Vatican in his official capacity, for the first time in the memory of living Frenchmen.

The Vatican did not leave the matter at that. It cemented its diplomatic victory with a religious-plus-patriotic triumph. And Joan of Arc, a woman whom the Church had burned, via the secular arm, because she had embarrassed the Vatican diplomacy of her time, was solemnly canonized. This, in view of the exalted state of French Nationalism at this period, was one of the most astute moves in the whole affair and enabled the Vatican to exploit French patriotic sentiment. The Government, caught once more in the Vatican's net, although composed of agnostic elements, in order not to offend popular patriotism had to take part in various religious ceremonies and pay public obeisance to the Catholic Church—something that had not been seen since the days of Napoleon III.

The Radical forces throughout France protested bitterly against this casting off of the Republic's traditional policy, particularly at the reception of the Papal Nuncio, and they raised such a storm in Parliament that the Government, caught between the two, to avoid a fall considered accepting their advice. The Vatican, however, determined not to lose what it had gained, intervened once more and exerted pressure from Alsace-Lorraine. The Alsatian Catholic deputies rose in the Chamber with a unanimous declaration. Their duty, they announced, was "to safeguard the paramount interest of the Church," which, properly translated, meant that they were again threatening the Republic with secession if diplomatic relations with the Vatican were interrupted. The Government was compelled to yield. Result: French Ambassadors to the Holy See have succeeded one another without interruption ever since.

.

In the Saar elections the Vatican openly influenced the electorate via the hierarchy. There are elections, however, when such interference is neither advisable nor useful. In such cases the Vatican tries to influence the electorate via the hierarchy, but obliquely—that is to say, by a doubtful display

of neutrality, meant to assuage hostile criticism, while at the same time swaying the electoral tide according to its will. The Rhineland elections were a typical example.

In March, 1936, Hitler, once more defying France and the League of Nations, occupied the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland. This, besides being an open defiance of solemn treaties, was also an ominous indication of things to come. All Europe reacted sharply to the *coup*, and various countries took military measures and, indeed, even mobilized themselves. Although Britain counselled France not to oppose the Hitler *coup*—and hence the success of the move was partly imputed to her—the reality of the matter was that the Vatican, prior to and after it, played a paramount role in the adventure. Hitler's second spectacular success again had been made possible, in fact, only by its co-operation.

But the Vatican's support of this second Hitlerian adventure, unlike the one in the Saar, could not possibly be too obvious, as by then the nature, methods, and aims of Nazism had been sufficiently displayed for world opinion to detest them. Any open supporter would have shared in the opprobrium. And the Vatican, more than any other Power, could not afford this lest it antagonize the millions of Catholics outside Germany.

Dictatorships, although undemocratic, as a rule pride themselves on the support of the masses. Hitler was particularly anxious to have the support of the Rhinelanders for his new *coup*. As with the Saar, however, Nazi slogans were not enough. But fortunately, like the Saar, the Rhineland was a Catholic part of Germany. The Catholic Church could help to tip the balance in Nazism's favour.

The Vatican was more than willing to do this, not only in pursuance of its general policy of strengthening the Nazi regime, in which it saw a great bulwark against Soviet Russia, but, again, to add more weight to its bargaining to force Hitler to observe the concordat. Prior to Hitler's *coup* the hierarchy was, therefore, ordered by the Vatican to initiate a cautious but persistent campaign with a view to persuading Catholics to support Nazism.

A considerable number of Catholics, however, in spite of this, continued to show marked antipathy to the regime. Its

tyranny, murders, concentration camps had become too well known to be totally ignored. Unless this hostility could be removed the coming plebiscite was seriously endangered.

The Vatican, however, was by no means at a loss. And soon it found a way by which to save its face while at the same time influencing doubtful Catholics to vote for Hitler.

The German bishops were instructed to issue a pastoral letter. This was addressed to all the Germans, although Catholic Rhinelanders were not slow to perceive that it was meant particularly for them. The letter, the gist of which had been drafted at the Vatican itself, recognized that in many Catholics there existed "a painful conflict of conscience" with regard to supporting the Nazi regime—that is to say, it recognized that many Catholics were against Nazism and therefore were not going to vote for it. To remove such hostility, consequently, it was necessary to remove the "painful conflict of conscience." Once that was achieved, the pressure of Catholic propaganda would do the rest.

And here the classic formula of *restrictio mentalis*—mental reservation—was set to work. Catholic sophistry—or, to be more realistic, dishonesty—which we examined before, does not corrode only the inner conscience of individuals. It can and does corrode the self-respect of whole regions, and sometimes nations, with concrete social or political results far transcending the mere moral issue involved.

The case of the Rhineland was a case in point, and the Vatican unhesitatingly implemented its "magic formula." The Catholic hierarchy, of course, did not bother to explain the subtle difference between equivocation, mental reservation, and the like. But, having reduced Catholic theological complexities to their simplest common denominator, they presented the Catholic electorate with the simplest of formulas.

Catholics who disapproved of Nazism and who, therefore, had decided to vote against it, had better vote for it, all the same. For it was their duty to strengthen the Fatherland (read, Hitler). As far as the qualms of their consciences were concerned, they could appease these by thinking, while voting for Hitler, that, although supporting him, they did not really approve of the things Hitler might do, of which they—or, rather, the Catholic Church—did not approve. Incredible

advice, coming from the seat of morality for the whole of the human race? Not at all. Here are the actual words :

We give our vote to the Fatherland, but that does not signify approval of matters for which we could not conscientiously be held responsible.¹

Thereupon, the whole religious and semi-religious machinery of the Catholic Church having been thoroughly mobilized, the hierarchy from the pulpits preached, praised, and hailed the Rhineland incorporation into Nazi Germany.

The elections were another Hitlerian triumph. Once the results became known, thanksgivings were held in cathedrals, church bells pealed everywhere, "Heil Hitlers" were shouted from almost every Catholic throat. Hitler had scored his second grand international victory.

From then onwards, having become certain of his stability and of the support given to his regime by many forces, inside and outside Germany, led by the Vatican, he set about carrying out bigger schemes, the results of which were, within three short years, to lead Europe to disaster.

.

While Vatican diplomacy can steer the policy of a country in a given direction, it can also, in reverse, bring about the downfall of a government of which it disapproves because such a government has taken measures antagonistic to the Church.

A typical instance of this occurred in France in 1951, on the question of Catholic schools, as we have already seen. Another case, showing the Vatican in all its most dishonest guile, occurred in the years following the First World War. During the tenure of office of the Radical Premier, Edouard Herriot, the new French Government announced a triple programme in connexion with relations between Church and State. This consisted of the following: first, the abolition of the Embassy to the Vatican, which had been provisionally resumed during the War and which, as we have already seen, had been created on the understanding that it was "for the duration" only; secondly, the enforcement of all pre-War laws regarding religious congregations, towards which the French Government had pursued a policy of *laissez faire*; thirdly, the abolition of

the special regime for Alsace-Lorraine, which had given separate denominational schools to each of the leading Churches.

The Vatican, which was inevitably hostile to such a government owing to its liberal elements, at the enunciation of these points mobilized its machinery and ordered the French hierarchy to co-ordinate all their forces to resist the new Government, indeed, to put up such pressure as to compel it to resign. The French hierarchy duly issued a signed declaration, and, after having protested against the action of the Herriot Government, it urged all French Catholics to employ every legal means to bring about its downfall.

The conflict rapidly became nation-wide, and France was soon divided into two bitterly hostile camps. The Prime Minister, during a remarkable address to the Chamber of Deputies, after having accused the Vatican of intervening in the political life of the country with the intent to dictate what laws the French State should and should not enact, covering matters which were the exclusive concern of a democratic government, warned the Vatican that a sovereign country could not tolerate the open intervention of an alien authority in its domestic affairs. "This is an open declaration of war," he said, referring to the orders of the French bishops. "Rome must cease its attempts to make of Catholicism a political party," he ended; "the Pope, by congratulating French Catholics for having organized against their own Government, has openly intervened in French internal affairs . . . instead of remaining politically neutral."

The Vatican, far from being intimidated, issued new instructions. And, having failed to bring about the Government's downfall by frontal attack, it launched upon most insidious, oblique tactics, soon destined to be crowned with success. On assuming power the Herriot Government had been confronted with a most disturbing secret, a legacy of the preceding Poincaré Government, which had caused the Bank of France to inflate the country's currency by two billion francs without letting the nation know anything about it. Herriot decided to fill the gap by vast internal loans, knowing that the very existence of his Government would depend on the success of this venture. Failure would mean disclosure of the secret,

accusations against his administration, and ultimate downfall. The Vatican—being well informed of the predicament in which the Government found itself, thanks to its Intelligence service in the form of Catholic politicians, a service which was to render invaluable hints in the case of the U.S.A. during and after the Second World War—ordered the French hierarchy to boycott the loans. A nation-wide campaign was immediately initiated. All Catholic media likely to influence public opinion—even the pulpits—were used. Catholics were warned, and indeed forbidden, to support the loans.

The vast majority of Catholics obeyed the injunctions. The loan plan was a complete failure. The Herriot Government fell.

To support a friendly government or to oppose a hostile regime the Vatican does not always mobilize the voters or the hierarchy of a country. There are occasions when its pressure, instead of being exerted at the bottom—that is, upon the electorate—is exerted at the top—that is, upon the leaders.

That is what happened with the Catholic Party in Italy shortly before and after the rise to power of Fascism. The Italian Catholic Party, following the end of the First World War, had grown to such an extent that within a few years of its creation it had become the largest single party with the exception of the Socialists. It was predicted, and with good reason, that it would shortly go into power. Two main factors, however, soon lessened its chances to attain such a goal: (a) the creation of the Fascist movement, and (b) the enthronement of a new Pope, Pius XI.

Pius XI, who disliked democracy, on assuming the Vatican leadership promptly discarded his predecessor's political strategy and no less promptly set in motion an entirely new one. Political Catholicism was substituted by alliance with anti-Communist authoritarian movements.

In Italy one of the major obstacles endangering the Fascist movement's rise to power was, ironically enough, the Catholic Party. This, at a critical stage of Fascist progress, negotiated with other parties for the setting up of a Coalition Government. The reason: to prevent Fascism from seizing power. The Catholic Party mobilized its rank and file, asking particu-

larly the Catholic clergy to support the new political alliance. No sooner did the Vatican hear of the project than it issued a circular letter, directed to the whole Italian hierarchy (October 2, 1922), in which it bade the clergy not to identify themselves with the project of the Catholic Party and urged them, instead, to remain neutral. Such an order at such a moment meant only one thing—repudiation of the Catholic Party and hence of the projected Coalition Government.

The Party, deprived, from such unexpected quarters, of the support upon which it counted most—namely, that of its very backbone, the clergy—felt itself so weakened that it no longer had the necessary weight to press for a coalition, which, owing to such a turn of events, never took place. A few weeks later, on October 22, Mussolini staged his March on Rome and, with the consent of the King, assumed power.

Within a few months (January 20, 1923) Cardinal Gasparri, the Vatican Secretary of State, had already had numerous secret meetings with Mussolini. In the course of these a definite bargain between the Church and Fascism was struck. The Vatican would not be hostile to the consolidation of the regime, but would contribute indirectly to its stability by the gradual removal of the regime's main political obstacle, the Catholic Party. The Party would, in due time, be reduced to impotence by the Church herself. In exchange, the Fascist Government would pursue a policy of friendship and co-operation with the Church, which had to be treated as a privileged body in the religious, educational, and political fields.

That same spring Mussolini decided to paralyse Parliament and came out with a proposal which, by compelling the Chamber of Deputies to approve an electoral reform, would assure the Fascist Party of at least two-thirds of the total votes in the forthcoming elections. The result of its successful completion would have been the first important step to open dictatorship. The Leader of the Catholic Party, supported by his 107 Catholic Party deputies, rejected the proposal. Their stubborn resistance seriously imperilled Mussolini's plan. But it did something more: it endangered the new grand policy of the Vatican itself, directed at establishing the first Fascist State in Europe.

The Pope acted with promptitude. On June 9, 1923, the

Leader of the Catholic Party received a peremptory order, direct from the Vatican, (a) to resign his leadership, (b) to disband the Party. The Leader was given no alternative. Although shocked, he bowed to the Vatican's bidding. He was not only a good Catholic, but a good Catholic priest: the double ties of blind obedience did not permit him to do anything else. With the removal of its leading spirit the Catholic Party swiftly declined. It did not dissolve immediately, owing to the resistance of many of its members who refused to bow to the Vatican's orders, but it never recovered from the blow. The following year the Pope ordered all priests still supporting it to resign. Two years later (1926) Mussolini, with the complete approval of the Pope, declared it illegal. The Italian Catholic Party was no more.

With its last internal obstacle wholly removed the Fascist Government at long last swiftly transformed itself into what both Mussolini and the Vatican had always wanted: the first European Fascist dictatorship, upon which all Fascist regimes in Europe were subsequently modelled.

In that same year (December 20, 1926), while the Leader of the Catholic Party was treading foreign soil on his journey to a long and bitter exile, Pius XI, "the man with no love for democracy," with all the authority of the Catholic Church and all his pontifical prestige to give weight to his words, after having praised the new Fascist State, solemnly declared its founder to have been sent by Divine Providence: "Mussolini is a man sent by Divine Providence," he said.

The Pope's praise echoed round the Catholic world. And although not all Italian Catholics bowed to the Papal will, most of them did so, swelling the ranks of the Fascist Party, while Catholics abroad began to look upon Fascist Italy as something to be imitated. After all, if the Church had given it her blessing, then the new Fascist ideology was good, and hence it was bound to prosper. Particularly if, as the Pope had so often declared, Fascism had come to destroy that greatest enemy of the Catholic Church: Communism.

.

The dissolution of a Catholic Party to pave the way for a dictatorship might be a comparatively easy matter when the

Party is as young and lacking in experience as was the Italian, created in 1919 and dissolved in 1926. When, however, a Catholic Party is more than half a century old, the keystone in the political balance of a great country, as it was in Germany, even the Vatican has to use caution. To force it to play a role to fit in with the Vatican's new grand political strategy, consequently, the tactics employed with the Italian Catholic Party would be not only useless but dangerous. Hence the adoption of an entirely different policy.

Here, the Vatican's basic, long-range strategy was the following: The Party, instead of being rapidly weakened and dissolved, had, on the contrary, to continue to play the paramount role it had played in the past; indeed, it had to acquire additional strength via political alliances or coalitions. This was not so much a useful as a necessary policy, in view of the particular political habitat. It would serve to encourage certain German Nationalist forces and Right-Wing movements gradually to steer the nation towards some form of Right-Wing authoritarianism. Once this had been accomplished the support of militaristic and industrial forces would help to install an outright Fascist dictatorship. A powerful Catholic Party, therefore, could become an invaluable instrument in the hands of German Catholicism, a most necessary key to the success of the Vatican's new European political strategy.

The role to be played by the German Catholic Party, being of an extremely difficult nature, had to be carried out under expert guidance. The Party itself, during this process, had to be carefully nursed, directed, and steered, not only by German leaders, but by a special representative from the Vatican. Once the ultimate objective—the installation of a Right-Wing dictatorship—had been achieved, the Catholic Party could safely be sent out of existence.

And that was precisely the role which the Centre Party of Germany was made to play, from the years immediately following the First World War to the rise of Hitler.

Unlike in Italy, here in Germany the Vatican employed almost exclusively political-diplomatic instruments. Its paramount ones: the Papal Nuncio to Germany, later Secretary of State of the Vatican, and the most influential non-German of the Catholic Party itself.

The Centre Party had been one of the most important parties in Germany from 1870 until 1933. Although essentially a Catholic Party, created with the definite task of furthering the interests of the Church in the political field, yet, as its very name implied, it followed mostly a middle road. For various decades it tried to keep a precarious but permanent balance between the Parties of the extreme Right and those of the extreme Left, with great success. Owing to its peculiar position it played a role disproportionate to its size. And the fate of Parties, coalitions and, indeed, even governments more than once came to hang upon the support, opposition, or neutrality of the Centre Party.

After the First World War the Centre developed a strong Left Wing in its midst. This, besides aiming at social reform, advocated the preservation of democracy in post-War Germany. For a period it seemed as if this Catholic Left Wing would carry the whole Party with it. Coalitions were formed with Liberals and even with Socialists.

In 1921 Erzberger, the leader of these Leftish Catholics, was assassinated. Shortly afterwards the Centre took a sharp new turn. Pius XI had become Pope and, as we have already seen, had embarked upon his policy of helping Right-Wing authoritarian systems throughout Europe. Germany, naturally, loomed very prominent in his new political plans; and, although Vatican influence there was not as strong as in Italy, yet, owing to the existence of a powerful Catholic Party, a policy designed to influence Germany to accept some form of authoritarianism favourable to the Church was conceived and promptly adopted.

A man of special qualifications was selected for this task. Although for some years undetected, he became the arbiter of the Centre Party and consequently, to a great extent, of German political life. The man: the Vatican's representative in Germany, Eugenio Pacelli, the Papal Nuncio and future Pope Pius XII.

Pacelli could not have been more suited for the job. He had been in Germany since 1920, first in Munich and then in Berlin, and had followed German politics so closely that he was quickly regarded as, not only an expert, but also the inspirer of the two German Catholic Parties: the Bavarian People's

Party and the Centre Party. No Catholic leader of either movement took a single important step without first consulting him; and, as Pacelli soon became the new Pope's right arm, the most important decisions in the long run came to rest with him.

At first the Papal Nuncio co-operated with Erzberger. To encourage the Catholic democratic leader? Far from it. To keep him in check. After Erzberger's assassination and the advent of the new Pope, Pacelli threw off the mask. All his exertions became directed to the attainment of two paramount goals: (a) to impart to the Centre Party an extreme Right-Wing orientation, and (b) to support all Right-Wing movements in Germany, via the influence of the Centre Party, with a view to setting up an extreme Right-Wing government or regime.

The first concrete results of his efforts were seen a few years later, when, in 1924, the Centre Party suddenly rejected the *Weimar* Coalition, which was composed of Catholic Left-Wingers, Liberals, and Social Democrats. The new Leader of the Centre Party, Dr. Marx, an intimate friend of Pacelli, never made a move without first consulting him. The rejection of the *Weimar* Coalition had been instigated by the Papal Nuncio. This was not all. Pacelli became the instrument thanks to which a coalition between the Centre Party and the German National Party was planned and carried out.

A new government was formed. And, ominously enough, the Chancellorship was assigned to Dr. Marx. The reading of the portent escaped the rank and file of German Catholics. But the move meant only one thing: the Catholic Party had embarked on an entirely reactionary policy. From then onwards it sold itself out completely to the heavy industrialists, super-nationalists, and militaristic elements, who came ever more swiftly to the fore with the quickening pace of German political events.

The Centre Party's swing to the extreme Right soon became one of the major factors in the strengthening of the reactionary forces throughout Germany. The first important phase of its alliance with the super-nationalist extreme Right-Wing parties lasted from 1924 until 1928. From 1928 until 1933 it became the major instrument to pave the way for the rise of the Nazi

dictatorship, under the personal leadership of Pacelli, first as Papal Nuncio to Germany and subsequently as the Vatican's Secretary of State.

It is no mere coincidence that the last two German Chancellors prior to Hitler's assumption of power were Catholics, the Leaders of the Centre Party, and the intimate friends of the former Papal Nuncio. It is also no mere coincidence that both strove to rule with Hitler; indeed, not only did they invite him to share their Governments, but it was chiefly thanks to them that Hitler was finally asked to form a Government.

Thus, while Dr. Brüning, Leader of the Centre Party and German Chancellor between 1930 and 1932, on two occasions invited Hitler into his Government via the formation of a coalition between the Centre and the Nazi Parties, Von Papen, the other Centre Party Leader and the last German Chancellor before the establishment of the Nazi regime, was the very man who persuaded Von Hindenburg, the German President, who had a great personal dislike of the Fuehrer, to call on Hitler to form a new Cabinet. It was mainly due to this that in January, 1933, Hitler finally became Chancellor of Germany. The Nazi regime had come into being.

At the head of the new Germany, and second only to Hitler, there stood the German Vice-Chancellor, the Leader of the Catholic Party, the personal friend of Pacelli, the Papal knight Franz von Papen.

Not long afterwards Hitler asked the Reichstag for an "Empowering Enactment" which would give him dictatorial powers within legal limits. To obtain this it was necessary for him to have a two-thirds majority. The success of his demand depended upon whether or not the Catholic Party voted for him. Hitler, who had already ingratiated himself with the Vatican by the unconstitutional suppression of the Communist Party, promised to open negotiations for a concordat, provided the Vatican ordered the Centre Party to vote for him.

On March 23, 1933, the Reichstag met, and the Catholic Party, led by its Catholic Leaders, former Chancellor Brüning and Mgr. Kaas, personal friend of Pacelli, voted for Hitler.

Von Papen was sent to Rome, and during three whole months negotiated for a concordat. Full agreement having

been reached, a formal pact between Nazi Germany and the Vatican was duly signed.

Almost immediately the Centre Party, having received, direct from the Vatican, orders to disband, issued a decree of *hara-kiri*, a decree of self-dissolution. After having stated how German political life had been put on an entirely new foundation, "which leaves no room for Party activities," the decree concluded thus: "The German Centre Party, therefore, immediately dissolves itself, in agreement with Chancellor Hitler" (July 5, 1933).

Many German Catholics, who knew nothing of the secret Hitler-Pacelli bargain, bitterly protested at the dissolution. Thereupon the Vatican came out with a semi-official statement which, in a few sentences, proved, even to the blindest, what had taken place behind the scenes:

The determination of Chancellor Hitler to eliminate the Catholic Party [it said] coincides with the Vatican's desire to disinterest itself from political parties and confine the activities of Catholics to the Catholic Action organization outside any political party.

As if this were not sufficient, the architect of the Nazi alliance, Pacelli, came himself to the fore and urged Catholics to do no less than co-operate with Hitler. To be sure, Pacelli, the arch-diplomat, wrapped his exhortation in some "equivocation." The meaning, however, could not be clearer. After having told Germans to resign themselves to being without their party, he told them to be loyal to the Nazi Government by being loyal to the concordat, for by so doing they would well serve both Nazi Germany and their Church:

On account of the exclusion of Catholics as a political party from the public life of Germany [he told them] it is all the more necessary that the Catholics, deprived of diplomatic representation, should find in the diplomatic pacts between the Holy See and the National Socialist Government guarantees which can assure them . . . the maintenance of their position in the life of the nation. This necessity is felt by the Holy See . . . and is a grave responsibility before the German Catholics. . . .

In spite of this, a stubborn section of German Catholics still refused to support Hitler. Mgr. Kaas, the Leader of the dissolved Catholic Party, thereupon on instructions from his

friend Pacelli, put it even more bluntly. Catholics must support Hitler, he said. They should not, and must not, have any fears about it. For Hitler's ideals were "noble ideals." After which, having proudly foretold how, now that Hitler was in charge of German destiny, the future would be a splendid adventure, he confidently assured those perverted who dared still to entertain serious doubts about it by declaring that he, both as a Catholic priest and as a former Leader of the Centre Party, as well as his personal friend, Pacelli, had the amplest confidence in the abilities of the Fuehrer. "Hitler knows well how to guide the ship," he prophesied.²

The ship which, according to the Vatican, Hitler could guide so well, within a few brief years was to be hurled by the mighty swell of Nazi hatred against the rocks of the Second World War, where it was smashed to the echoing curses of the millions whom his folly had sent to their untimely graves and to the quarrelling of the living, wandering ever more gloomily in a devastated and ever-darkening world.

14

DEADLINESS OF VATICAN DIPLOMACY IN WAR

VATICAN DIPLOMACY'S INHERENT LACK of principle is cultivated as effectively in war as in peace. Indeed, it is at its best during hostilities because of the secrecy of the activities of the warring powers.

Nations, particularly in the West, often seem to believe that because the Vatican at times can side with them it does so because it has their interests at heart. There could hardly be a more foolish illusion. The Vatican has never promoted the interests of anyone except when, by so doing, it has furthered its own. As soon as this has been accomplished it will, should the opportunity arise, abandon or even betray its former ally without the slightest qualms, and, indeed, strike an alliance with somebody else, provided this is to its advantage, even if the latter is the enemy of the former.

This occurred in the case of the Philippines, when it did not hesitate openly to side with Japan, blatantly abandoning the U.S.A., as far as it dared to do so without hopelessly jeopardizing American goodwill.

When, during the Second World War, Japan, having attacked the U.S.A. at Pearl Harbour, started on its meteoric career of conquest, one of its most prized Asiatic possessions

became the Philippines. At this period the Vatican, believing the Japanese conquests to be of a permanent character owing to the fact that the Fascist powers were at the height of their success and the Allies at their lowest ebb, acknowledged the newly extended Japanese Empire by exchanging ambassadors with Tokyo. The move—at this juncture a very significant one—while causing exultation in Japan, created corresponding indignation in the Allied capitals, and this to such an extent that the Vatican went so far as to court the risk of making a permanent enemy of Roosevelt and other Allied leaders. The cause of it all, although not very obvious to many, was of the gravest consequence in the general conduct of the war in the East. The Philippines, in the eyes of the conquering Japanese, had a special significance, which had to be exploited to the full. Possession of the islands gave Japan tremendous prestige throughout Asia, as these had not only been territories belonging to the United States, but also had a considerable Western population—a fact, this, which could enable Japan to “colonize an outpost of the white race.”

Immediately following the conquest Japan set out to make of the Philippines the crown jewel of her military-political victories, and the better to achieve this it began in earnest to cultivate the support of the population. With such end in view it made a solemn promise to grant the Philippines complete independence by 1946. In October, 1943, a Constitution was promulgated, and in that same month a Republic was actually proclaimed. After this the Japanese went through the motions of dissolving the military government, and Tokyo, in addition to boasting to all the Far Eastern peoples of its magnanimous treatment of a conquered territory, pointed at the Philippines as a concrete example of Japan's determination to banish “White Imperialism” from the Orient for all time.

In spite of such gestures the discontent of the population not only remained but continued to grow. At this stage Vatican diplomacy came to the fore. And it set out to do no less than consolidate Japanese Imperialism in the islands.

This was possible owing to the fact that the Philipinos were mostly Catholics. The Japanese were smart enough never to forget the role which religion could play in political affairs. Consequently, in addition to exploiting political and racial

feelings, they set out to exploit with equal zest the religious sentiments of their new subjects. The attachment of the Philipinos to the Catholic Church, the Japanese came to believe, would and could be made to play a most important part in securing their co-operation.

Appeals to the Philipinos, asking for support, were, therefore, repeatedly issued. Many promptly collaborated. Others, however, remained neutral or even passively hostile. To swing these over to their side the Japanese pointed out that the Vatican was supporting Japan. Did the Philipinos need concrete proofs? Then they could ponder upon the significance of the Vatican-Japanese exchange of ambassadors, which had occurred in the previous year (1942). Even after this a considerable section stubbornly refused to co-operate. The Japanese decided upon another move, and when in the following year the Philippine Republic was set up, they simply declared that the Vatican had recognized the new Japanese-sponsored Philippines (October, 1943).

To appreciate the importance of this announcement it must be remembered that the Philippines at this period had more than 13,000,000 Catholics. Their political attitude could be felt outside the Philippines, the only Christian-Catholic nation in Asia. Their example, whether for or against the Japanese, could greatly influence the 5,500,000 Catholics in India, the 3,250,000 in China, the 2,000,000 in Indo-China, the 800,000 in Indonesia, the 600,000 in Ceylon, and other Catholic groups scattered throughout the Asiatic continent.

The announcement brought a swift denial from the Vatican. The reasons which prompted it were obvious. Since the previous year, when Japanese-Catholic negotiations had been initiated on this problem and the exchange of ambassadors had taken place, the course of the Second World War had greatly altered, both in the East and in the West. The certainty of a German-Japanese victory had vanished. Indeed, the Vatican had already taken the first ominous steps to ensure its own future with the potentially victorious Allies by engineering the downfall of Mussolini in Italy (July, 1943). In addition to this, the bad blood which the Japanese-Vatican exchange of ambassadors had caused between the Vatican and Washington was still hampering the restoration of more harmonious relations with

the U.S.A. And, as we shall presently see, the incident of Timor Island and Portugal's refusal to enter the War had made the position of the Vatican even more precarious with the White House.

The War, however, was not yet over and by no means won. Japan was still occupying immense territories. No one knew how many of these might remain in its possession, even after possible defeat. It was therefore a wise policy not to alienate the Japanese at this stage. While to support them in the open entailed obvious perils, to support them with discretion might prove just as efficient and ultimately extremely beneficial to the political plans of the Vatican.

Having decided upon this new course the Vatican changed tactics. It withdrew as a conventional diplomatic Power, and began to operate disguised as a religious organization. Result: the Church took over where conventional diplomacy left off. A Catholic Friendly Society was formed, to give what the Japanese called "a practical demonstration directed at protecting the religion of the Philippino people." After consultation with the Vatican Japan dispatched Catholics to the Philippines to consolidate the "morals" of Philippine Catholics. Their real object: to persuade Philippine Catholics of the necessity to consolidate Catholic-Japanese-Philippine co-operation and thus help the puppet Philippino Government to carry on in co-ordination with their Japanese masters.

The Vatican's blatant or secret support of Japan, its sly co-operation with Japanese aggressive Imperialism, its even slyer efforts to cow the Philippines into alien submission via indirect and even direct religious, diplomatic, and political pressure ended in nothing.

This, however, was not because of a change of heart on the part of the Vatican, but because of something wholly outside its control—that is, because Japan lost the War. Had Japan won, the Vatican would have co-operated with it to the hilt, wholly impervious of whether a Nazi-Japanese victory would have spelt a partial or even total enslavement of the world.

The Vatican's basic rule—"the Catholic Church, right or wrong"—is not a myth. It is reality, the inspirer of its diplomatic exertions, and hence never to be forgotten in peace or especially during a shooting war.

Vatican diplomacy can influence the conduct of nations and even the most important act of their foreign policy—namely, the declaration of war—as proved by the case of Portugal.

In October, 1943, conquering Japan occupied Timor, a Portuguese territory in Asia. Portugal, after vainly repeated protests, decided to enter on the side of the Allies and to declare war on Japan. Portuguese intervention was keenly desired by the United States and Britain, as it would have put at their disposal the Western coast of Europe, which they longed to use for submarine bases. It must be remembered that at this juncture the civilian and military supplies to the Allies were gravely endangered by the Nazi U-boats, and that the Portuguese bases, therefore, had assumed an incalculable value to their cause. Previous Allied pressure having been vain, it was confidently expected that Portugal, at long last, would discard her neutrality and side with them.

The Vatican, however, thought otherwise, and, although at this period it was no longer sure whether the Nazi-Japanese aggressors would win the War, yet it dared to act almost as if they might still turn the tables in their favour. As long as there was the faintest chance of their doing so, the Vatican saw to it that the enemies of the Axis should not be helped, either directly or indirectly, and least of all by a Catholic Power.

The Vatican, which was still pursuing a policy of thinly veiled co-operation with Japan in the East—e.g. via its supporting of the Philippine Republic—could not contradict its own general strategy by following a different course in the West without stultifying its own designs, even if these did need radical modification.

Hence the necessity that Portugal should not enter the War. Catholic Salazar was easily persuaded to remain neutral, to resist all Allied pressure, and not to yield any concession without first consulting the Holy See.

Portugal's adverse decision came promptly to the ears of the Allies, and their reaction was as blunt as it was quick. The most acid protests were dispatched from sundry Allied capitals. To whom were they directed? To Portugal? By no means. They were sent to Rome, where the "Portuguese" decision had been taken.

President Roosevelt, who until then had managed to main-

tain fairly cordial relations with Pius XII, in spite of the Japanese-Vatican friendship, made it clear that Vatican interference had greatly damaged the Allied cause and that reaction against the Catholic move might have a very harmful effect upon future American-Vatican relations. Roosevelt's personal representative was sent to the Vatican; and, for an anxious period, Myron Taylor scurried between Rome and Washington, trying to breach the American-Vatican drift. At long last the Vatican—and this was primarily due to the fact that the War was going from bad to worse for the Axis—not wishing to jeopardize its future, persuaded Salazar to cede to the Allies the Azores, "on lease," to be used as naval bases, just as "a compromise."

The gravity of the Vatican's opposition to the Allied cause—and hence the seriousness of the harm it could do to a vital Allied strategic operation—can be gauged by the fact that the Vatican exerted similar pressure upon Catholic Eire, who, throughout the conflict, had also stubbornly refused to lend anti-submarine bases to the Allies. The refusal had been motivated, not only by Eire's genuine desire to stay out of the fight, but also by her genuine sympathy with Nazi Germany. That this was not a myth was proved beyond doubt by a most significant Irish gesture. When Berlin fell, and Hitler, with his empire tumbling about him, finally committed suicide, the whole world sighed with a sigh of relief, and, indeed, rejoiced. One government, however, the devout Catholic Government of devout Catholic Ireland, did not do so. De Valera, after having heard Mass on behalf of the soul of Hitler, directed that Eire should officially demonstrate her sorrow at the death of the Fuehrer. A telegram, expressing most sincere condolences at his untimely death, was sent to the phantom Nazi Government by Ireland, the only country in the whole world to take this step.

.

There are occasions, however, when hierarchical mobilization is unnecessary: indeed, when it is totally ignored and the diplomatic machinery of the Vatican is operated in its entirety within and outside any given country simultaneously.

The effectiveness of Vatican diplomacy, when made thus

to gambol in its proper element—that is to say, in the diplomatic-political morass of international intrigue—can be deadly. It can substantially contribute to the formation of a new government, and, indeed, even to the collapse of a dictatorship—e.g. Fascist Italy.

Only a few years after her entry into the Second World War Fascist Italy began to show the first serious cracks in her armour. These were caused, among other factors, by the blows of the Allied armies and a growing popular subterranean discontent, manifested in the reappearance of revolutionary propaganda of an extreme Left-Wing nature, in the organization of menacing strikes, in the formation of underground movements, and similar political phenomena.

At the Vatican these were seen as portents presaging the collapse of Fascism. A Fascist collapse, however, although a most regrettable event, was no longer viewed as an unbearable calamity. And this was due to the fact that the War, meanwhile, had brought great changes in the political and military map of the world, and, last but not least, that the military recovery of the Allies had already made obvious which side was going to be victorious. In view of this the Vatican had already begun to swing to their side in its attempt to save what it could of the floundering Fascist Europe. If the fall of Fascism was accepted with resignation, the prospect of what would replace it gave the Vatican the shivers. For Fascism's downfall would mean a resurgence of that same Red peril which Fascism had so successfully curbed. The spectre of Communism had thus become a menacing reality once more.

A drastic policy was conceived, carefully planned, and promptly executed. The fall of Mussolini had to be hastened, to prevent the underground revolutionary forces from taking over at the moment of the Fascist collapse. His fall would have coincided with the setting up of an authoritarian regime. In this manner a Communist revolution would have been strangled at its very birth. The Allies, who, with the exception of Soviet Russia, feared the revolutionary elements as much as did the Church, supported the scheme. The Vatican, which had already been in contact with certain factions in Italy, including the Italian Monarchy, set to work.

The plot took concrete shape in the early spring of 1943.

One of its chief tools: Mgr. Spellman, Archbishop of New York, a close friend of Pius XII, who charged him with the task of becoming an intermediary link between himself, President Roosevelt, and the Italian plotters. Spellman arrived at Rome, contacted the chief Fascist conspirators—among them the King of Italy (February 22–23)—and various others, including Papal diplomats abroad, and reported progress to the White House. He travelled here and there, meeting people charged with carrying out the new policy on which the U.S.A., Britain, and the Vatican had embarked. Among others, two very prominent Papal diplomats in Istanbul, Mgr. Pappalardo and Mgr. Clarizio, of the State Secretariat of the Vatican.

News of the secret negotiations, however, soon leaked out. The *New York Times* (May 18, 1943) broke the news, as did *The Times* of London, which stated “from a well-informed Vatican source” that a plan had been elaborated “in a special message from Pope Pius to Archbishop Spellman, at present in the Middle East.” The plan aimed at making possible Italian “voluntary collaboration in the ousting of the Fascist regime” and “an armistice at once.”

On the night of July 25–26, 1943, a revolt broke out inside the Fascist Great Council. Mussolini went to see the King and was arrested. The fall of the Fascist regime, which had lasted more than twenty years, had been as simple as that.

A military dictatorship was promptly set up. Secret negotiations with the Allies were swiftly initiated, and the Italian people, who for a few days following the fall of the Duce had wildly celebrated the return of freedom and the coming of peace, within weeks found themselves under the heel of the new regime, run by Italian and Allied military authorities, while the War, which they had believed was ended for them, crept with ever-increasing fury from Sicily up to the Alps, bringing devastation and death throughout the peninsula for almost another two years.¹

At the Vatican library, meanwhile, one of the employees was busily engaged with officials of the Vatican Secretariat of State, often conferring with Pius XII himself. In 1944 the defunct Italian Catholic Party was resurrected and launched in wrecked Italy, apparelled in the vestments of democracy. Its leader: Alcide De Gasperi, the former Vatican Librarian, the

future Catholic Premier of post-War Italy, the man who for many eventful years was to sway Italian democracy in the direction willed by both the Vatican and the U.S.A. in their dire attempts to mobilize Europe against the Bolshevik giant, looming ever more menacing in the red sky of the East.

It took the armed might of almost three-quarters of the world, the total industrial mobilization of the West, millions of lives, and almost six years of war to make Hitler bite the dust and to smash for good his monstrous creation: Nazi Germany.

The saying that when diplomacy ends war begins, or that when war begins diplomacy ends, is not altogether true. For the warring nations, no matter how bitter their struggle, will always maintain some diplomatic channels, although indirectly and with discretion. This is done mostly via neutrals, their respective Intelligence services, and sometimes even via elements on either side desirous of bridging the gulf, each to further their own policy and sometimes even to further the cause of peace, provided this harmonizes with the interests of their country.

As the channels through which their exertions are carried out are those of the most secretive diplomacy, it inevitably follows that the Vatican is made to play, as a rule, no mean role.

This is precisely what occurred throughout the Second World War, particularly in connexion with Nazi Germany. Hitler had been helped into power by the Vatican. He had the blessing of the Church in his fight against Communism. Yet, when the time came, the Vatican did not hesitate to plot to have him removed, so as to further its own grand anti-Russian policy. This occurred soon after the subjugation of Poland, and prior to the offensive in the West, which was to bring about the fall of France (winter, 1939-40). Vatican diplomatic labours, at this early stage, centred on the scheme to bring about a "negotiated peace" between Nazi Germany and the Allies. A negotiated peace meant not only a Nazi peace, but, what was more important, the promotion of a Nazi-led European coalition, to be eventually hurled against Soviet Russia.

Different Vatican suggestions and schemes were brought before certain Nazis and certain Allies at various intervals. One of these was finally considered. It consisted in the replacement of Hitler by a top Nazi, not as compromised as the Fuehrer. The potential new leader, however, had to possess sufficient authority to negotiate with the Allies without bringing about the downfall of the Nazi regime. The man selected was a Catholic—a lapsed one, it is true, but, perhaps more significant, a former pupil of the Jesuits—Dr. Goebbels, the Nazi Propaganda Minister. The idea, concocted at the Vatican, after receiving considerable support both in certain Allied quarters and in some German circles, ended in nothing.

Diplomacies are diplomacies because their task is to attempt the difficult. Any such attempt has to consider failure. Failure, however, being part and parcel of diplomacy, does not mean the failure of any of its ultimate goals. Very frequently persistent failures have led to success. If this be reckoned as a characteristic of secular diplomacy it is certainly the very essence of Vatican exertions. The failure of the Vatican's "Goebbels" scheme promoted new plans, all of which had two things in common: (a) negotiated peace between Germany and the Allies, and (b) Nazi-Allied coalition against Russia.

These two goals were sought with as much eagerness by Hitler as they were by the Vatican. Before launching his offensive against the West (spring, 1940) Hitler, in fact, conducted negotiations with certain Catholic-Fascist forces in France with a view, by avoiding the Nazi-French-British clash, to turn the Nazi-French-British war machines jointly to the East. We shall examine these negotiations in more detail presently.

Hitler was so keen on this plan that he permitted one of the most spectacular attempts to make it a concrete reality by sending on a mad solo flight one of his chief Nazi lieutenants, Rudolf Hess. Hess took a plane, landed in Britain. His mission: to contact certain pro-Nazi British elements and induce them to persuade the British Government on the projected negotiated peace, as a preliminary preparation for the oncoming Russian campaign.

For Hitler had already decided to attack Russia. The

Vatican had been informed of it all; indeed, it knew the precise date of the Nazi attack long before it took place. The information had been supplied by Hitler's Chief of the Secret Police, Admiral Canaris.

Canaris was an enigmatic, sinister figure. He was on intimate relations with Catholic General Franco. Indeed, to a great extent, Franco owed the existence of Catholic Spain to him. For it was chiefly on the advice of Canaris that Hitler and even Mussolini sent the volume of soldiers, guns, and other help which eventually turned the scales of the Spanish Civil War in Franco's favour.²

Canaris's original intention was to inform not only the Vatican, but also the Allies, and, indeed, even Russia, of Hitler's coming attack. He posted one of his most trusted agents at the Vatican, from where his information was eventually transmitted to British Intelligence agents, also with headquarters at the Vatican. When the Vatican got wind of Canaris's wish to inform Soviet Russia also of the approaching invasion, it promptly blackmailed him with the threat that, should he notify Soviet Russia of the date of the coming attack, the Vatican would inform Hitler of Canaris's betrayal.³

It was thanks to this that no warning was ever passed to the Russians, from this reliable source, of Hitler's most fateful decisions. The Vatican, like Hitler, wanted Russia to be taken by surprise, surprise in war being accounted almost half of total victory.

But while the Vatican had been the main stumbling-block to Soviet Russia's receiving the warning, it exploited that same secret to the utmost with a view to inducing the Allies to come to an understanding with Hitler.

Franco was told about it, with the advice that he side openly with Nazi Germany. Franco never gave any definite reply. He was willing, but could not do it. The flames of civil war were still smouldering under the surface. Spain's intervention on Hitler's side would have imperilled his Catholic dictatorship. However, he offered a compromise, and set out to organize a special anti-Bolshevik division, to be sent to the Russian front, to fight with Hitler's army. This became known as the Blue Division, composed of 17,000 selected men—most of them wearing prints and medallions with the image of Our

Lady of Fatima. Under pressure from the Vatican, Franco went further :

If the road to Berlin were opened [he declared in a speech], then not merely would one Division of Spaniards [the Blue Division] participate in the struggle [the anti-Communist struggle], but one million Spaniards would be offered to help.

The U.S.A.—or, rather, President Roosevelt—was also informed. The Vatican's arch-diplomat, Pacelli, now Pius XII, took extra-special precautions, however, that the news should not leak out to the Russians via the American State Department. He personally saw to it that his Secretary of State, Cardinal Maglione, as well as Roosevelt's personal envoy, Myron Taylor, be sworn to the utmost secrecy. The information was hardly mentioned in the diplomatic dispatches between the Pope and the President, although hints of it were put on record in some of the latter's papers, not to be published for twenty-five years.

Taylor was one of the leading American millionaire industrialists and as much an arch-enemy of Soviet Russia as was the Vatican. His disclosure to an extremely carefully selected body of American magnates functioning as a kind of invisible government in the business world of the U.S.A. helped the launching of a tremendous super-Isolationist campaign throughout the U.S.A. This was meant to help Hitler by assuring him of U.S. neutrality, and thus encourage him to smash Russia. The campaign, Catholic- and Big-Business-inspired, reached its climax between Hitler's Russian invasion and Pearl Harbour, when the U.S.A. was brought on to Russia's side with a bang.

Vatican efforts to rally the Allies to Nazi Germany had failed once more. Hitler attacked Russia. Within three months he was outside Moscow, Leningrad, Stalingrad. But within three years his armies were retreating in utter collapse, under the relentless blows of the Red Army.

The advance of the Russians wrought terror in several quarters outside the Fascist countries. Besides creating undisguised anxiety in the Allied field it caused a veritable panic at the Vatican.

Schemes for a separate peace and for the removal of Hitler followed one another, conceived in succession by Germans, by

the Vatican, by certain elements in Rome. As early as May, 1942, General Beck, Goerdeler, and others sent emissaries to the Allies. One of these was Pastor Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who went to Stockholm, where he met an Englishman, Dr. Bell, Anglican Bishop of Chichester. The task of these emissaries: to find out whether the Allies would be prepared, once Hitler was overthrown, to deal with a bona-fide German Government for a peace settlement.⁴

Less than one month after the overthrow of Mussolini—that is, “in August, 1943,” as was subsequently testified in 1952—“there was already a plan to arrest Hitler, Goering, and Himmler in Hitler’s headquarters, known as the Wolfsschanze. Everything was ready for action, including the intervention of a trustworthy tank division, but the plan failed because the three Nazi leaders did not turn up at the Wolfsschanze as had been expected.”⁵

In that same year, 1943, German generals planned to get rid of Hitler by seizing him during one of his visits to the Central Army Group in Russia.

By that same year the Western Allies had accepted the general political strategy conceived at the Vatican, meant to forestall the breakdown of Fascist Europe with the setting up of authoritarian regimes, with a view to preventing Communism from filling the void left by the fall of the Fascist dictatorships.

It was at this period that it was decided to apply the Vatican’s grand scheme to the whole of Europe. Its first application, in Italy, had been a great political success. The advance of the Russian armies towards Germany made it imperative to repeat the same technique with Hitler. The Vatican, the U.S.A., and Great Britain set to work and soon contacted certain individuals in the military, Intelligence, and political fields in Germany, with whom a plan was prepared for the removal of the Fuehrer. Many of the plotters acted from self-interest, and huge sums of money were paid out by the American Intelligence; but most of them had at heart the salvation of Germany. German salvation, for them, meant one thing: the prevention, not of the Western, but of the Russian armies, from entering German territory.

In the spring of 1944 Vatican diplomacy became very active,

in that type of discreet but ominous activity which previously had always portended something of importance. Observers were reminded of the exertions which had preceded the fall of Mussolini in the previous year. Key ambassadors, beginning with Hitler's ambassador to the Vatican, followed by the British, and by President Roosevelt's personal envoy, were received in private audience by the Pope or by important officials of the Vatican State Secretariat with increasing frequency.

Myron Taylor returned specially to Rome, where he became the centre of such activities. Hitler's ambassador at the Vatican, the former head of the German Foreign Office, Baron von Weisacker, who had schemed for some years for Hitler's removal, became one of the main liaisons. German and American prelates also actively encouraged some of the plotters.

The German resisters had been warned to act before the Allies invaded the Continent. The reason was obvious. At this time, it must be remembered, the Allies had not yet set foot in Europe—that is to say, the Western Allies. As Russia was advancing towards Germany at an increasing pace from the east, the plotters were urged to get rid of Hitler, set up a new Government, sue for peace as swiftly as possible, and thus prevent the Russian armies from occupying Germany.

The plotters, spurred by these and other motives, made and unmade one scheme after another, all without success. The original scheme of seizing and trying Hitler was also finally abandoned. Further ideas proved to be either fantastic or impossible to execute. The Russian armies, meanwhile, continued to advance westwards with increasing celerity. Time had run short, and nothing had yet been done to get rid of Hitler. Then, unexpectedly, when everyone seemed resigned to the worst, a plan, dictated by desperation, was put forward: quick assassination of the Fuehrer.

Two men, perhaps more than any others, were responsible for this daring project, "Count Stauffenberg and Major Ulrich von Oertzen, in collaboration with General Treschow."⁶

Count von Stauffenberg was Chief of Staff in the General Army Office, under Infantry General F. Olbritch, the latter being one of the leading conspirators. Von Stauffenberg was

a pious and staunch Catholic, who had dedicated his life to two goals: to the furtherance of the interests of Germany, and those of the Catholic Church, and to the promotion of cordial enmity against anything resembling Red.

The plotters had prepared a careful scheme. After the assassination of Hitler they would set up a provisional Government, headed by the Christian Democratic Union Party. This would have spelt a military dictatorship on the lines of that of Marshal Badoglio in Italy. Their first move would be to sue for peace, and hence promptly stop the Russian advance. Simultaneously, the new Government would see that the revolutionary German elements which might come to the surface would be strictly controlled. The military dictatorship would be followed by a very centralized Government, and by the restoration of the Monarchy. To quote one of the plotters: "In addition, it was felt that there must be one department that stood above political discussion, for the character and history of the German people are such that leadership cannot be built up exclusively from below. To meet this need many of us favoured a monarchy."⁶

"Leadership cannot be built up exclusively from below" had first been stated by the Popes, as we have already seen. The sons of the Church, on this occasion as on so many others, were again acting upon this formula.

The plan of assassination was a desperate one. It entailed almost certain death, not only for Hitler, but also for his assassins. The group who had agreed on it now hesitated about its implementation.

More days went by, and nothing concrete was done. The Vatican grew impatient and sent desperate messages to the plotters, urging them to act before it was too late. The Allies warned that if nothing was done they would no longer consider any separate peace. It became known that the Russians were determined to push westwards, in order to enter Berlin before the Western armies got there.

This prompted some to act. It was decided to kill Hitler during one of his usual military conferences. Several volunteered for the assassination—e.g. General H. Stieff of the High Command, Major Kuhn, and Lieutenant A. von Hagen. Owing to one unfavourable event following another, and pos-

sibly to lack of nerve, the attempt was postponed from week to week until finally the plotters gave up all hope.

The Allied invasion of Europe meanwhile had taken place, but, what was still worse, the Russians had followed it with a terrific offensive from the east (June 22, 1944) and were rapidly advancing towards the German frontiers. Complete disaster could, however, still be averted, provided something was done without losing one single day.

At this stage what neither patriotism nor fear of social revolution, political upheaval, or national defeat had had the force to do religious conviction and the will of men believing it their duty to take any risk, cost them what it may, to defend the interest and perhaps even the very existence of their Church from its arch-enemy, made them spring to action.

Count von Stauffenberg, the intimate friend of Cardinal von Preysing, Bishop of Berlin, who drew his political inspiration from *Utopia*, the work of another famous defender of Catholicism, St. Thomas More,⁷ stepped forward and decided to kill Hitler himself. On July 10, 1944, Count Stauffenberg told Dr. Karl Lukaschek, a member of the resistance movement, that as the Russian armies were advancing "no chance of salvation remained" and that the situation was hopeless. "Nothing is left to me but to murder the tyrant," he told Lukaschek.⁸

In the words of one of the plotters:

Ten days later [dating from June 22, the date of the Russian offensive] I received a message from Count Stauffenberg. He had decided it was impossible to wait any longer. He was going to kill Hitler himself. We would be prepared for the assassination to take place any day.

The offer was even more remarkable as

in the original planning Stauffenberg had not been considered as a possible assassin, since he had only one hand, from which two fingers were missing. But he was fearless and able, and one of the few resistance men who were in a position to get at Hitler.⁶

July 20, 1944, arrived. Hitler went to his usual conference hut. Catholic von Stauffenberg entered the hut, deposited his brief-case upon the table, and after a few minutes departed, unsuspected. The brief-case was loaded with explosives, timed to go off within a few minutes. There followed a terrific explosion. Von Stauffenberg, from nearby, had no doubts that Hitler and all those who were with him had been killed.

He, General Olbritch, and others began to put into execution their detailed plan. They began by holding General Fromm, Commander of the Home Army, their prisoner. An embryo provisional government was set up in Berlin. But the plotters had their own way for only a couple of hours. Hitler was still alive. Catholic von Stauffenberg and Olbritch were immediately executed. General Beck, Marshal Rommel, and others were allowed to commit suicide, and 4,980 men and women were executed. It was a massacre in comparison with which that of 1934, when Hitler himself had killed some of his closest associates, seemed child's play.

The plan which had worked so well in Italy had completely miscarried in Germany.

The Vatican issued swift orders to the German hierarchy to side with the surviving and revengeful Fuehrer. Thanksgivings were offered in German churches. Cardinal Faulhaber⁹ sent his own and his bishops' congratulations to Hitler on his "miraculous" escape. A solemn *Te Deum* was sung in Munich Cathedral, after which the Vatican remained wholly mute. But then, as the Red armies were rolling towards Berlin, while the Pope once more began his lamentations, Vatican diplomacy set feverishly to work in a frantic effort to side with the victorious Allies.

In the spring of 1945 the Red armies rushed towards Berlin, the Western Allies occupied the towns of Western Germany. In April and May Hitler's armies collapsed, and on May 7 Germany surrendered unconditionally. Thus ended Nazi Germany and the Second World War in Europe.

But if the war had terminated for Europe, it had not ended for Vatican diplomacy. For the fall of Nazi Germany had not spelt either the partial or even less the total failure of its global anti-Communist crusade. The tumbling of the Nazis had been the closing of one chapter, the dawning of peace the beginning of a new one.

Within a short period, in fact, Soviet Russia had already replaced Nazi Germany as the main enemy of the West. And the anti-Communist Catholic hate campaign, hallowed by new allies and promoted by up-to-date tactics to suit the trans-

formed political landscape, soon yielded ominous results. Nazi criminals were released *en masse* throughout the French-, British-, and, above all, American-occupied territory; the great industrialists, generals, and armament-barons were reinstated to their former positions; Krupp, from a war-criminal's cell, went straight to his Krupp plant, to resume cannon manufacture (1951). While this was taking place a new German Government came to the fore in Western Germany, under the protection of the anti-Russian Allied Trinity, while in Eastern Germany another saw the light under the auspices of Soviet Russia. And, in no time, defeated Germany, like Europe, had split into two hostile camps.

The mobilization of two-thirds of Germany against Russia had been accomplished by the cunning and the foresight of Vatican diplomacy. Western Germany's alignment with the Western Powers, in fact, could justly be accounted its most successful master-stroke since the fall of Hitler. The adoption of its new diplomatic-political strategy could not have better justified itself than by the swift recruiting of a prostrated Germany on the side of those nations who had so recently defeated her.

The birth and nurturing of the first Western German Government had been rendered possible by the adoption of a policy which had already proved extremely successful in another country—namely, in Italy. There the Vatican had managed, not only to set up a friendly government, but to install an administration wholly docile to its social and political bidding. Although the repetition of such a feat in a partly Protestant land was fraught with difficulties, yet the Vatican, thanks once more to its unparalleled diplomatic skill, not to mention its alliance with the U.S.A., managed to install, not only a friendly government in Western Germany, but a government, or rather the head of a government, who was as docile to its political demands as was the Catholic Premier of Italy—daily Mass-goer, daily Communion-taker, Chancellor Dr. Konrad Adenauer (autumn, 1949).

The installation of one of the Vatican's pet political creatures in a rapidly emerging Germany was indicative, perhaps more than any other measure taken since Germany's defeat, of the shape of things to come.

In the domestic field one of the most sinister symptoms was the emergence of General Otto Remer, as already mentioned in Chapter 12, the man who had smashed the 1944 anti-Hitler plot and who, after having openly promoted a neo-Nazi movement, sent scores of neo-Nazi deputies to Parliament (1950-1-2).

In the foreign field the new Germany was ever more blatantly committed to the foreign policy of the Western Powers, which tied her with ever-multiplying war ties, "to save Christian civilization from the peril looming from the East."

These words were pretty familiar. They had been chanted for so many fateful years by the raucous voice of the now dead Fuehrer, plunging, as they had done, all Germans into the abyss of the Second World War.

In spite of so recent an example, Hitler's incantation, after the installation of the Western German Government, was chanted once more to the bewildered German masses. The chant was repeated by that most fanatical devotee of Our Lady of Fatima, Catholic Adenauer, who, in obedience to the bidding of his Church, had had not the slightest compunction in committing a still mutilated and occupied Germany to a policy which would lead the German people once again into a new era of disasters.

It was thus that, within a brief period, Germany, although still bleeding and divided, faced the astonished peoples of Europe as an overhauled anti-Communist war-machine, wholly subservient to the U.S.A. and the Vatican, determined to use Germany's vast military potential and preparing to hurl her once more into the vast expanses of the Russian plains, where the armies of Hitler had faltered with such ignominy only a few years before.

The two world massacres, which had brought such unforgettable horrors and devastation to German cities, had not yet been enough. Another mighty conflict had begun to head towards a still-prostrated Germany from the swiftly darkening skies of Europe, of the Americas, of Asia, and of Soviet Russia. Malignant, perverse forces, this time outside Germany, had decreed that the German masses be sacrificed once more to the insatiable gods of war. Among these there loomed prominent the most malignant of all the evil genii of modern Germany: the Vatican.

15

VATICAN'S TOTAL WAR AGAINST HOSTILE STATES

IN ALL THE INSTANCES GIVEN SO FAR, THE Vatican, to reach certain specific goals, has confined itself to employing religious, political, and diplomatic means.

There are cases, however, when it can and does advocate open, armed rebellion. That usually happens when it finds itself face to face with a hostile government with which it cannot reach a tacit *modus vivendi* or which, having banned the Catholic Church, tries to enforce to the letter all its hostile laws. In such cases a real war, giving no quarter and usually ending in bloodshed, is waged.

War cannot break out in every type of State. It is possible only when the State concerned is framed on a democratic basis or, at least, allows its citizens a certain amount of liberty. For were it to be fought under a dictatorship, the Catholic Church would not be allowed to gather forces of any kind that might endanger the existence of the government (cf. the Orthodox Church in Soviet Russia after the Revolution).

Owing to the very nature of the civil constitution of a democratic State, each citizen or body of citizens can oppose the government by legal means. The Catholic Church—and, for that matter, any other Party—can take full advantage of this

privilege to carry out its plans of opposition and thereby embarrass the government, to undermine its power, to organize itself so that it can disregard all the laws it wishes. As far as Catholic resistance is limited to legal means it is free to act in any way desired. Should it, however, purposely trespass into illegality, then even a democratic government is compelled to take certain precautionary as well as punitive measures to restrain those who contravene its laws.

When that occurs, such a government is compelled to punish any Catholic who has obeyed his spiritual leader's injunctions—that is, the hierarchy, the most active members of the laity, and all those Catholic organizations which by their actions have placed themselves outside the law.

As, however, no government is capable of arresting, fining, and punishing individually a great portion of the people it governs, it is bound to take stricter measures against the religious and political leaders of Catholicism, thus creating fresh cause for bitterness and resentment.

With the intensification of the struggle, the Catholic Church—which in the meantime may have made underground preparations for open revolt—might decide that the moment to overthrow the government by force has come, and hence can ask all Catholics to take up arms.

When the situation has reached this stage the Church will boldly declare that Catholics are bound to disregard the laws of the State and, besides, that it is their duty to fight it by every means. Every means, including assassination. This many will call exaggeration. But instances when meek sons of the Church murdered their opponents because these were hostile to the Church or to the interests of the Vatican are written in blood in many pages of history. To be sure, the Catholic Church has disclaimed any encouragement of or even association with them. How could she?—the seat of morality! However, to promote them via the secretive maze of religious, diplomatic, political emotionalism is indeed another thing.

Assassinations are not obsolete intimidation of past romantic Catholic sagas. They can be and are still used.

President Lincoln was killed by a Catholic. Mere coincidence? We shall see presently that it may have been anything

but coincidence. As there are no proofs however, the fact that a Protestant head of a Protestant land was murdered by a member of a tiny Catholic minority could have been a true freak of history. It was not a historical freak when another Catholic, a Belgian, in 1875 wrote a letter to the Archbishop of Paris in which he offered to murder the German Protestant Chancellor, Bismarck, because of the anti-Catholic laws which he had passed in Germany,¹ or when a third Catholic attempted to dispose of Bismarck by way of assassination. This last would-be murderer admitted that he wanted to kill the Iron Chancellor because Bismarck was fighting the Catholic Church with his Kultur Kampf.

In Mexico, in 1927, the President was assassinated the day after he declared that he would enforce the Mexican Constitution of Separation of Church and State.

In 1930, in Malta, as we have already seen, after the head of the Maltese Government, Lord Strickland, had opposed the Maltese hierarchy—and the Vatican—on the question of Church and State, the Maltese archbishop inflamed Catholic fanaticism to such a pitch that a few days later (June, 1930) an attempt was made on Lord Strickland's life.

In France Catholics planned the killing of King Alexander of Yugoslavia and of Barthou, the French Foreign Minister, in 1934. The reason: King Alexander represented Orthodox Serbia, which was subjugating Catholic Croatia and "persecuting the Catholic Church."²

In Nazi Germany, as we have already noticed, a Catholic tried to assassinate Hitler—now a useless dictator as far as the Catholic Church was concerned—and although the motives which prompted the attempt were mostly of a political nature, basically the religious element was the determining factor which prompted Count Stauffenberg to attempt to destroy the Fuehrer.

In Italy, during the most fateful general election of 1948, a Catholic tried to assassinate Togliatti, the leader of the Italian Communists, wounding him so badly that he lay between life and death for several weeks.

In Belgium, after the Communist leader had opposed the return of Catholic King Leopold and had spoken against his Catholic son's succeeding him (August 18, 1950), two Catholics

knocked at his door, and when the Communist Deputy opened it he was promptly shot dead.

The list could be prolonged.

The Catholic Church does not stop at inciting her members to individual assassinations. She will incite them to communal bloodshed by inspiring and promoting bodies of volunteers to fight "the enemies of the Church."

In the first half of the last century she promoted the Sanfedisti, as already mentioned, to kill and destroy the Liberals. In 1870 she organized an international army of volunteers, ready to protect, defend, and fight for the Pope after the Liberal Government of Italy took over Rome and the Papal State.

In Mexico she encouraged volunteers to fight the enemies of the Church—that is to say, to fight the legal Mexican Government.

In Spain, from 1936 to 1939, she organized "Catholic volunteers," from practically every country, to fight against the Republican Government, "riddled with the enemies of the Church."

During the Second World War she organized special Catholic battalions, divisions, or even whole armies, to fight with Hitler against Communist Russia: Franco's Blue Division, Leon Degrelle's Catholic volunteers in Belgium; the Catholic Slovak Army in Slovakia; the Catholic Army, the Ustashi in Yugoslavia, and many others.

Being ready to resort to physical violence, including individual and mass-killing, therefore, the Catholic Church, if and when she has decided to wage war upon any given hostile government, will mobilize all her members, "as an army drawn up in battle array," as Pope Leo XIII declared.³

Overnight all good Catholics, consequently, can and will be transformed into partisans of the Church and bitter foes of the State, and act accordingly. Crowds without a leader are powerless. So leaders will spring up, usually in the person of prominent banished Catholic politicians, generals, or even priests, whose task is to lead their followers against the government. The government, of course, must defend itself, and civil war is started. The result is bloodshed; the country is torn asunder and atrocities are committed by both sides.

Fanatical individuals, urged by either political or religious zeal, attempt to assassinate the head of a Godless government or the Catholic leaders before or after open revolt has started, and increasingly bitter feeling will induce both sides to fight to the end, but their fight will not be confined to themselves.

Complications will arise, not only within the boundaries of the country concerned, but outside them. Neighbouring States will become involved for either religious or political reasons. Result: the original domestic struggle will assume an international character and affect more governments.

The neighbouring States thus affected need not of necessity be Catholic. They may be Protestant, or even entirely indifferent to religious problems.

It is obvious that when such a neighbouring State is Catholic, it is much easier for the Church to order the population to exert pressure on the government to urge it to intervene and put an end to the persecution across its borders.

Should the neighbouring State be Protestant, however, the Catholic Church will still be in a position to put pressure on a Protestant government. This is mostly for the following reason: whereas a country may officially be wholly Catholic (e.g. Franco's Spain), no country is wholly Protestant. A nominally Protestant country, in the religious sense, is divided and subdivided into numerous denominations which, to live freely, have of necessity evolved religious toleration, by which any religion can flourish, including the Catholic.

This means that in any given Protestant country the Vatican has at its disposal usually an extremely zealous minority. This minority is ready to start a campaign to influence the non-Catholic strata of the population by appealing to its sentiment regarding religious liberty. By arousing in them hatred of a tyranny that persecutes the Church, a Protestant government may eventually be influenced to act.

Although at first this seems far-fetched, it is possible and has actually happened. It is not difficult to understand how it can be brought about if we remember that a government (assuming it is a democratic one) cannot forget that its re-election is dependent upon a majority of votes. This consideration will force it to try to please as many electors as possible. It is rare for any administration to obtain an over-

whelming majority. Therefore, minorities are made to exercise more weight than they would otherwise have, at times becoming the determining factor of electoral victories or defeats.

A wise administration, therefore, will be very careful to meet the demands of its Catholic groups—which often are disproportionately powerful in relation to their numerical strength. The most striking instance: the Catholic pressure group in the U.S.A., where, although less than one-fifth of the total population, it exerts a political influence out of all proportion to its number.

Obviously, factors which are very little or only distantly related to the religious problem can affect the issue. This, however, is no hindrance to a determined Catholic minority, always ready to welcome social, economic, or political allies.

Sometimes this is done: (a) by striking a bargain with nationalist elements desirous of getting rid of an alien rule; (b) by forming a partnership with big industrial or financial concerns desirous of preserving or attaining economic or political gains in a neighbouring country; (c) by intervening within the sovereign territory of a State supposedly persecuting religion, by screening such intervention with non-religious issues and attempting the destruction of its legitimate government by means of war.

Whichever the case, the Catholic Church can endanger not only the stability and existence of any given State, but also that of neighbouring nations, of a whole hemisphere, and in fact of the entire world.

Statements of this nature may, in addition to being exaggerated, seem to be lacking in foundation—indeed, to be improbable and even impossible. Yet instances of this kind have occurred time and again. We shall confine ourselves to some typical contemporary cases with a bearing upon some of the situations quoted above.

.

Since the early loss of her independence the foremost dream of Ireland was national freedom. The wish to be free is as natural to any proud race as the breathing of the air of their country. Consequently, it was logical that when the oppor-

tunity came the Irish should take up arms and revolt against the ruling power, England.

The question of Irish independence was intimately connected with several historical and racial problems. It was also a very important religious one. That is to say, it was—even if never too openly acknowledged as such—a fight between Catholic Ireland and Protestant England which resulted in the local resumption of hostilities between the Catholic Church and her old foe, Protestantism.

In the eyes of the Catholic Church Protestantism basically is still as hated an enemy as it was at its inception. Although Catholic struggles against it have been relegated to the background by time, history, and the rise of even more dangerous enemies, the Catholic Church has never avoided opposing it whenever the occasion arises. Her opposition can take the form of subtle, almost undetected, enmity, or can explode into open violence screened behind the apparel of nationalism—racial claims and the like—depending on the circumstances.

Ireland gave a striking demonstration of this, and indeed of the ominous fact that whenever the Catholic Church is given the opportunity to strike a blow against Protestantism, via individuals or nations practising it, she will not hesitate to do so.

From the Reformation and until this very day, in the eyes of the Vatican, Ireland has been the northernmost outpost of Catholicism, situated at the very gates—or, rather, inside the gates—of the Protestant Anglo-Saxon world. In view of this, therefore, Ireland since the Reformation assumed a paramount significance which, in the grand strategy of the Vatican, has not by any means diminished since the gaining of her independence.

Vatican exertions directed at helping the Irish to acquire their freedom had as their ultimate aim the creation of a Catholic State wholly subservient to the Church; a goal which was successfully achieved, as the case of the hierarchy and the mother and child scheme—of 1950—so strikingly demonstrated.

To believe that the Vatican always had at heart the freedom of Ireland and of the Irish people for their own sakes, however, would be to believe that myth is objective history. The Vatican co-operated with Irish revolutionaries in the first two

decades of our century simply because it suited the Vatican to have a free Ireland. Had Vatican interests run contrary to Ireland's desire for independence, the Vatican would not have had the slightest hesitation in co-operating with her enemies or oppressors so as to keep the Irish in servitude.

Rash accusations? Facts!

At one time in the dim past of the Middle Ages it was to the Vatican's advantage to strike some kind of political bargain with England, for reasons which are too numerous to recount here. We have already seen of what the bargain consisted. The Vatican (and the fact that an English Pope was then sitting on the throne of St. Peter, the first and last Englishman to be elected Pope, is no valid excuse) sold independent Ireland to the English king. It was as simple as that. Consequently, all the subsequent sufferings, fighting, and bloodshed in occupied Ireland were caused originally by the action of the Catholic Church.

As long as it suited her, an Ireland in servitude was looked upon as the will of Divine Providence which had decreed the punishment of the wicked Irish for their sins and to help England to squeeze blood and money from them, and, last but not least, to enable the Popes to press England into political alliances favourable to them. As long as the enslaved Irish could be exploited by England and Rome simultaneously all was well, and the question of Irish freedom was as unknown to the Vatican as the existence of the still-undiscovered Americas.

When the two partners quarrelled, things changed. England not only rejected the Vatican's religious and political claims of supremacy over the British Isles but repudiated the Catholic Church altogether and set up her own brand of Christianity. The English king, with his historic procession of wives (some of whom he had nonchalantly murdered), who was endowed with manners that would have put to shame the rudest butcher of the realm, became the head of the new English Church. Further, while creating a precedent with regard to later centuries, he despoiled the Catholic Church of her immense riches, pocketed most of them himself, and told the Vatican that England was for the English and not for the Popes.

The slogan 'England for the English' produced a startling effect in Rome. The Vatican suddenly focused attention upon Ireland.

Ireland was Catholic. The Irish had always been very generous with Peter's Pence. Ireland, therefore, had to be saved from the rapacity of Protestant England. It had to be freed. The slogan "Ireland for the Irish" echoed hollowly in the Vatican's corridors and down the centuries until 1917. Not uninterruptedly, to be sure. There were times—and these coincided always with Catholics having installed themselves once more in England, even if for short but hopeful periods—when the Vatican was struck with amnesia and wholly forgot the Irish slogan.

It was only when, finally, English Protestantism became permanently established that "Ireland for the Irish" became a permanent feature of Vatican diplomacy.

Not that the Vatican gave any effective help to Irish patriots at any time, except prior to and during the First World War, when Irish patriots by helping themselves had brought their dreams near completion. Why, as recently as the last century, the Vatican on more than one occasion attempted to strike secret bargains with Protestant England, to the detriment of Irish liberty, in its effort to help Catholics to re-emerge into the English social and political fabric, "with a bang."

The latter attempt having been partially successful, Vatican diplomacy favoured Ireland and blessed—although still with reservation—the Irish bid for independence. Even at this stage, however, the Vatican, while encouraging the Irish to rebel, was simultaneously betraying them by secretly negotiating with England.

It was conducting a most ambiguous policy with a view to cheating both and making ready to side with the winner, regardless of the latter's identity.

That this was the Vatican's policy prior to the completion of Irish independence was asserted by Lloyd George, then Prime Minister of Great Britain.

At this stage it was impossible to reach any satisfactory settlement of the Irish question, Lloyd George repeatedly declared, owing chiefly to the Irish clergy. His efforts at negotiation were either rejected or, if initially successful,

ultimately ended in failure. At long last the British Government, having decided to get at the real source of inspiration of such policy, made direct approaches to the Vatican. Discussions were begun directly with the Roman Curia; Cardinal Gasquet became one of the principal negotiators; the Irish hierarchy were given a definite line on their attitude in connexion with the timing, methods, and nature of the Irish resistance and the British counter-resistance.

Even so the problem, Lloyd George had again to admit, was never solved, because the Vatican, with its usual diplomatic duplicity, was playing a double game—with both Ireland and England—sometimes pretending to work for a compromise and for moderation, at others siding with Britain while very often encouraging to its utmost Catholic resistance whenever England did not comply with certain Vatican proposals.

The length to which Vatican duplicity went can be judged by the fact that, while the Vatican was secretly encouraging the Irish priests, who at one time had become the very backbone of Sinn Fein, at the same time it was promising the British its full co-operation in restraining the Irish hierarchy from helping the Irish rebels. This, it should be noticed, was being done while, ironically enough, Protestant Britain went to no end of trouble and, as we have already seen, by ignoring many constitutional difficulties, managed to break a long tradition and send an official envoy to the Vatican.

The Vatican's assurances to Protestant England at this stage were given mostly to encourage her to send an ambassador to the Holy See, knowing very well that once a precedent had been established the rest would follow.

Vatican promises to restrain the Irish hierarchy were typical Vatican lies, the Vatican knowing well that it was not going to keep them if the Irish rebellion, which it was helping to foment, proved successful. That this was its set policy was proved by the fact that it fostered Irish rebellion before the First World War. So much so, that at the outbreak of the War, in 1914, the Irish College in Rome had already become a hotbed of plotting and counter-plotting; a distributing depot for revolutionary literature; and, last but not least, an important centre of intelligence between Ireland, the Vatican,

various countries of the British Empire, and the Irish nationalists.

The role played by the Vatican from this period onwards was not confined to rousing patriotic plus religious zeal among the clergy and the people in Irish towns. It became diplomatic, political, and even military co-operation, blessed by the highest authority of the Vatican—the Pope; co-operation which was eventually to lead to the actual outbreak of the rebellion.

After the creation of the Irish Free State the Vatican threw off the mask and, while not disclosing the real role it played, it boasted of having greatly helped the success of the Irish resistance by outwitting the British. Indeed, it went so far as to declare that without its encouragement—and, above all, without the diplomatic negotiations carried out between the Vatican and the British Government, which served only to keep the British at bay—the Irish Free State probably would have remained but a dream.

For once the Vatican was boasting of something that was true. But it did not boast of the whole truth.

It did not boast of the whole truth for one very good reason: its duplicity and lack of principle in the whole affair had been of such a nature as to make it very difficult for English Catholics to stomach. Indeed, the disclosure of its conduct would have created the gravest embarrassment at the British Foreign Office; not to mention the moral discredit into which Vatican diplomacy would have sunk in the eyes of the English, Irish, and indeed Catholics the world over had they known the whole truth.

The Vatican's co-operation with the Irish nationalists, at a time when it was giving the most direct assurances of neutrality to the British—which, in fact, it had been giving throughout—was of such a character that three weeks before the actual insurrection took place the Irish Republican Provisional Government judged it necessary to send a special secret envoy to the Pope to disclose to the Holy Father the actual plan, place, and date of the revolt.

Vatican participation in the Easter Rebellion remained a close secret for almost two decades. Great Britain, however, having had more than one hint of the lengths to which it had gone, repeatedly sent unofficial protests to Rome asking for an

explanation, urging the Vatican either to confirm the story or to deny it, with all the authority at its disposal, as such "unheard-of insinuations" were causing serious bad feeling and could create the gravest complications between the Holy See and the British Government; not to mention the damage they were doing to the completion of Catholic emancipation in England itself.

The Irish hierarchy vehemently denied all "those recurrent rumours," declaring that these were nothing but the base insinuations of anti-Catholic forces, the fabrications of the enemies of the Church, and the obvious efforts of Protestant England to smear the name of the Catholic Church. The Vatican confirmed, with official and semi-official statements, what the Irish hierarchy said, and for many years the matter remained like that.

However, nations, like women, cannot keep secrets for ever. And one day some time in 1933 an Irishman, a devout Catholic but not wholly versed in the intricacies and long-range schemes of the Vatican, believing that he was doing a good turn to his Church, disclosed the whole truth by publishing the actual facts in the Irish Press.

The writer had some qualifications for dealing with the subject: he was none other than one of the main revolutionary leaders, the Irish Prime Minister, De Valera.⁴

Both the Irish hierarchy and the Vatican were taken by surprise, but again vehemently denied that any secret envoy had ever been sent to the Vatican, still less that he had been received by the Pope. The denials, however, this time proved false. For now the envoy himself came to the fore, to confirm the truth. The following is what Count Plunkett, the secret Irish envoy, had to say.

There I was received by His Holiness; for nigh two hours we discussed fully the coming struggle for Irish Independence. The Pope was much moved when I disclosed the fact that the date for the rising was fixed, and the reasons for that decision. . . . Then the Pope conferred His Apostolic Benediction on the men who were facing death for Ireland's liberty. . . . Back in Dublin on Good Friday, 1916, I sent in my report of the results of my mission to the Provisional Government.

In the General Post Office, when the fight began, I saw again the portion of that paper relating to my audience with His Holiness in 1916.

G. N. COUNT PLUNKETT,

Ascension Thursday, 1933.⁴

No one will ever dispute the claims of Ireland, or of any people, to independence. The episodes just described, however, are striking illustrations that the Vatican never hesitates to encourage revolutionary activities, to plot with one country to the disadvantage of another, to plunge both into a state of war, to transform them into religious-political satellites, provided the results further its religious or political interests.

Yet the fact that all the centuries of Irish suffering were partially due to the Church, after one of her Popes (because at that period it suited the Vatican) did not hesitate to sell Ireland to an English king, had better be remembered, lest her regained freedom be used again, not to the advantage of the Irish nation, but to the advantage of a spiritual master who, should it serve his purpose, would not hesitate to sell once more Ireland's freedom, as he had done already, so unscrupulously, in the past.

.

The Irish case had endangered only two countries; but there have been instances when the activities of the Vatican have imperilled the peace of a whole hemisphere—e.g. the civil war in Mexico.

In the middle of the decade immediately following the first world conflict (1926) President Calles, after much procrastination, enforced the Carranza Constitution which had been adopted as far back as 1917. By so doing he struck at the two most powerful elements which, up to then, had dominated the life of the nation: the Catholic Church, the wealthiest single institution in the land, and the big American Oil Corporations, which owned more of Mexico's productive industry than did the entire Mexican population.⁵

The enforcement of the Constitution meant, for the former, the radical separation of Church and State, limitation of absurd religious privileges, withdrawal of the Catholic quasi-monopoly of education, reduction of ecclesiastical wealth; for the latter, expropriation and public ownership of the Mexican subsoil.

The Vatican unhesitatingly declared an all-out war on the Mexican Government.

The Mexican hierarchy received precise instructions for the mobilization of the entire religious and political machinery of

the Church. From all the pulpits, from all the Catholic Press, from pastoral letters, the faithful were urged to disobey the State, to boycott its laws, to arm and march against the Government. Overnight the whole of Mexico was racked by demonstrations and counter-demonstrations. Acts of violence, riots, and political murders occurred everywhere with such frequency that they semi-paralysed the life of the country.

At such mass mobilization the President issued repeated warnings that, unless the Mexican hierarchy ceased to foment unrest, stronger measures would be taken. His warning fell on deaf ears. In July four rioting Catholics were killed by Government troops. To the Mexican bishops that was the signal for the revolt. The faithful were organized in armed battalions on a nation-wide scale. At the New Year, to the cry of "*Viva Cristo Rey!*" ("Long live Christ the King!") they banded under the leadership of the head of the League of Catholic Youth, Capistran Garza, who, by direct orders from the Vatican, at long last had raised the standard of insurrection. The Mexican bishops proclaimed him "Provisional President," and General Arteaga their military leader.

The revolt spread. Soon the Catholic Church claimed eleven States on her side; the Government, only five. Calles arrested Archbishop Ruiz y Flores. The Pope denounced the arrest as a persecution of religion, a crime against freedom, called for prayers throughout the world, and initiated a global hate-campaign against Mexico.

Simultaneously His Holiness began to spin a web of diplomatic activity in many countries, especially in Latin-America and the U.S.A., with a view to having Mexico ostracized abroad. We shall refer only to the part this played in the U.S.A.—a Protestant nation—as another concrete proof of how the Catholic Church can influence the policy of a non-Catholic country. This was done Vatican-fashion—namely, via the mobilization of the religious machinery of another powerful hierarchy. The Vatican's Secretary of State issued detailed instructions to the American hierarchy on the policy to be followed concerning the Mexican civil war. Result: almost overnight the U.S.A. began to be flooded by Catholic propaganda urging a holy war against the Mexican neighbour.

American Catholic newspapers, American Catholic politicians, American Catholic bishops openly advocated direct American intervention in Mexico. American Catholic exertions found formidable allies in the Oil Corporations which—the designs of Catholic Providence are truly inscrutable—at this juncture had miraculously become deeply concerned with the religious rights of the Catholic Church. The U.S.A. must intervene to stop such ghastly religious persecutions, they said. How could the U.S.A. permit the Mexican Government to slaughter Catholic priests? The persecution was the work of the Third International. “Calles is an Atheist,” chorused the American bishops, “a diabolical enemy of Christianity.” “He is the anti-Christ!” shouted speakers of the Knights of Columbus, that Catholic American organization of the thousand-and-one holy scapulars and even holier tin medals. They passed a most Christian resolution urging the State Department to lift its embargo on arms and to wage war upon the Mexican Government. The American hierarchy proved to be no less Christian and it simultaneously began to exert a tremendous pressure on the State Department, with a view to making the U.S.A. intervene on the ground that “the persecution of Calles is without parallel since the days of Nero and Diocletian.”

Not the whole of the U.S.A., however, was so easily deceived by American Catholicism's war-mongering. The volume of protest against the Catholic Church's call for war soon created a reaction which recoiled upon American Catholics themselves. The Catholic bishops, with that duplicity which is a Catholic characteristic everywhere, realizing how they had gone too far, issued a pastoral letter explaining that “what we have written is no call on the faithful here or elsewhere to purely human action . . . or to reach those who possess political power anywhere on earth, and least of all in our own country, to the end that they should intervene with armed force in the internal affairs of Mexico for the protection of the Catholic Church.” We did not mean that, they repeated. What we meant was to warn America that “Christian civilization” was in danger. A slogan repeated twenty years later by Mussolini and Hitler, and thirty years later by the Vatican and the U.S.A., to justify their parallel preparation for war against Soviet Russia. “Our

duty is done when we sound a warning to Christian civilization that its foundations are again being attacked and undermined," they said. "For the rest, God will bring His will to pass in His own good time and in His own good way."

The last sentence was not a pious, rhetorical embellishment of the message. Their lordships, the American bishops, had previously been informed that certain high American political and financial interests had been successful in persuading good American personages whose main concern—after the safety of their oil wells—was, curiously enough, also the safety of Christian ideals, to take certain concrete steps to see that the Mexican Neros be stopped.

In April, 1927, the United States War Department concentrated practically all its aircraft in Texas, for "manœuvres." War correspondents packed up and followed the Army. War over the border was imminent. The American hierarchy urged American Catholics to recite the rosary, so that the intentions of the Holy Father and, incidentally, of Senator Fall should be heard with approval by God.

The rosarian chanting must have echoed in the celestial vaults somewhat belatedly for, in the meantime, across the frontiers the Catholic revolt had been crushed and, although in the mountains Catholic rebels continued their civil war, most of the population had begun to return to their ordinary daily tasks.

The U.S.A. sent an ambassador to Mexico with the mission of settling the religious struggle, prior even to settling the question of Mexican oil. But before that could be accomplished the Catholic Church, who wanted at all costs to control Mexico, set on foot a new plan. This was put into operation almost immediately after General Alvaro Obregon was elected as the Mexican President on July 1, 1928. On the 16th Obregon openly blamed the Catholic Church for the civil war and stated that he would carry out the policy of the previous President—namely, he would enforce the Mexican Constitution. The following day he was promptly assassinated by a Catholic.

Ex-President Calles went to interview the assassin in person, who, in answer to the question, "Who instigated you to take the President's life?" declared: "Christ, our Lord. In order that religion may prevail in Mexico."

The American Press, like most of the world Press, declared the report false. The Vatican stated authoritatively that Calles was unable to speak the truth because no Atheist knew what the truth was. The world should, instead, believe the Mexican hierarchy and, last but not least, the Holy Father. Calles and his devilish supporters were lying. If it were not so, why did the Mexican Government not let American and Catholic journalists interview the accused? The Mexican Government obliged, and invited as many American Press representatives as were willing to interview the murderer. They had a two hours' talk with him. The assassin not only repeated what he told Calles but declared once more: "I killed General Obregon because I believed he was the instigator of the persecution of the Catholic Church."

At the trial Toral (the assassin) confessed that the Mother Superior of the Convent of Espiritu Santo, one of the suppressed institutions, had "indirectly" inspired his crime by repeatedly telling him that "Religion is being destroyed," and that "the only solution is the death of Obregon, Calles, and the Patriarch Perez [*sic*]."

The war between the Catholic Church and the Mexican Government did not end there. It went on unabated for many more years, during which the Catholic Church continued as nefariously as ever to prevent timely economic and social reforms from being carried out, in a determined effort to impose upon a rebellious people a domination which they had so stubbornly and bitterly rejected.

.

The Mexican War was confined to civil strife, but the danger of foreign intervention was only narrowly avoided. There have been cases, however, in which the Vatican, having started a civil war, has succeeded in enlisting the help of foreign armies, thanks to which it was possible to bring about the destruction of the legitimate government and the installation of one wholly subservient to her: e.g. Spain.

The reasons which in 1936 made the Catholic Church declare war on the Spanish Government were, broadly speaking, similar to those which had prompted her in Mexico. Two main factors characterized the Spanish, as compared with the

Mexican Civil War: (a) that interested forces urging intervention for mere industrial and financial reasons were almost nil, and (b) that the Vatican enlisted the active military help of two countries with no free public opinion—i.e. two Fascist dictatorships.

The basic causes of the war were neither new nor exceptional. At the beginning of the century, as in many other nations, economic, social, and political discontent, coupled with the influx of new ideas, had made Spain stir with restlessness. Radical movements opposing Church and Monarchy appeared and gathered strength during and after the First World War. Result: a dictator came into power in 1923. His programme: the Nation, the Monarchy, and the Church.

Discontent caused the fall of Primo De Rivera and a general election followed. The Vatican ordered the Spanish hierarchy to urge Catholics to vote only for those supporting the Monarchy and the Church. The Primate of Spain followed suit.

The Spanish people went to the poll and gave a prompt reply: it swept away the Monarchy and elected a Left-Wing government. On April 14 the Republic was proclaimed. "May the Republic be cursed!" was the charitable welcome of Cardinal Segura, on hearing of its birth. After which he went piously to chant a solemn Requiem Mass.

In October the Cortes passed a resolution for the separation of Church and State and an act prohibiting teaching by religious orders. The Vatican instructed the hierarchy to prevent the passing of the new Constitution. The Spanish bishops wrote a pastoral letter and urged all Catholics to defend the Catholic Church by boycotting the Government. Priests began to engage in active plotting against the State. E.g. the Vicar-General of Vittoria, arrested while carrying letters of a treasonable nature from the Primate of Spain and, from the contents, in which the Vatican itself was clearly involved. The Government repeatedly asked for an official explanation, without result.

Meanwhile the new Constitution had been passed. Separation of Church and State was made a reality, complete religious freedom was granted, divorce by mutual consent permitted,

civil marriage adopted, and the secularization of education approved.

A cry of horror at such fiendish legislation was emitted by the Vatican. A violent, relentless Catholic opposition was promptly started on a large scale throughout Spain.⁶

The Government, instead of being intimidated, continued with its reforms (1933). Church disestablishment was approved by 278 to 50 votes. Church property estimated at £100,000,000 (one-third of the nation's wealth) was nationalized. Eighty thousand monks and nuns were permitted only contemplative lives within the walls of their monasteries.

At this the Vatican took concrete action. It ordered the Spanish hierarchy to promote an open rebellion. The Spanish bishops issued a pastoral letter and urged disobedience.

While the seeds of active civil war were thus being sown, the Pope came to the fore and, after excommunicating the President, the Premier, and other rulers of the Republic, declared a "spiritual war" between Spain and the Holy See in an encyclical, *Dilectissimi Nobis*.

The new Primate of Spain, Archbishop Goma, began to incite Spanish Catholics to direct rebellion :

Unjust laws merit neither respect nor obedience [he preached]. Supervision of education, marriage and public culture are inherent rights of the Church; by their very nature they should be under religious control. We must bring about their repeal. . . . We must abandon retreat and make a valiant stand.⁷

Instructions were issued for the adoption of "Catholic Action" and for the closer co-operation of hierarchy and laity. Two Catholic leaders, the millionaire Juan March and a newspaper proprietor, Gil Robles, answered the hierarchy's roll-call.

Robles organized Catholic squads on the model of Italian and German Fascism and began to import gunmen. The Government, in its liberality, made the mistake of admitting Catholics to the Cabinet. Gil Robles secured for himself the Ministry of War and began to put Catholics in command of key positions in the Army. Socialists, radicals, and others banded together and formed a Popular Front. A bitter struggle, which lasted throughout 1935 and part of 1936,

followed. Result: the Cortes was dissolved and there was another election. The Centre won 62 seats, the Right 148, and the Popular Front 263.⁸

The Vatican, which had hoped to get control of the Republic by using the tactics of the Trojan horse, on seeing its plan frustrated immediately set to work on a second scheme, long prepared, for just such an eventuality.

In close alliance with the most extreme elements of the Right, Catholics openly organized a campaign of violence. The followers of Gil Robles, as well as the whole Catholic Youth Organization led by General Franco's brother-in-law, joined the Fascist Falange Española, founded in 1932 by the son of Primo De Rivera. Others swelled the ranks of the Monarchists, whose leader preached military rising. In addition, a most Catholic and reactionary military group, represented by the Union Militar Española, from as far back as 1933 had been plotting the violent overthrow of the Republic. By 1934 it had already planned a *coup d'état*, having been in touch with the Fascist Government of Italy to secure the support "not only of the Italian Government, but also of the Fascist Party, in the event of the outbreak of Civil War in Spain."⁹

The plot for civil war at this stage was so far advanced that, immediately following the victory of the Popular Front, Gil Robles and General Franco had the audacity to propose to the Republican Prime Minister a military *coup d'état*, before the Cortes could meet.¹⁰

On July 17, 1936, the army in Morocco occupied Gueta and Melilla, and officers rose in many Spanish towns. As soon as the revolt broke out, General Franco made haste to let the Pope know that his coup had succeeded. The Spanish Civil War had begun.

The Catholic hierarchy, with few exceptions, sided with the rebels and asked the Almighty's blessing on the new crusade. "We are in complete agreement with the Nationalist [Franco's] Government," declared Cardinal Goma, Primate of Spain, "which never takes a step without consulting me and obeying me."

From the very start Franco made it known that he had come to destroy the Republic and to restore the Church to her

former position. The Papal banner was unfurled over the rebel headquarters at Burgos, and the Pope had Franco's flag raised over the Vatican.

The Catholic plot had aimed at a sudden and complete seizure of power all over Spain. It miscarried. The people rose in defence of the Republic in such a vast majority that only one thing could save the Catholic rebels: foreign arms.

As soon as the Vatican became persuaded that the Catholic plotters could not win unaided, it decided to give them help, this time from outside Spain. It urged a willing Mussolini to send arms and soldiers; it reached a tacit agreement with Hitler, by virtue of which, in exchange for German help, the Vatican would launch a world-wide crusade against Bolshevism.

Pius XI called upon the civilized nations to rise against the "Red monster" which had "already given proofs of its will to subvert all order, from Russia to China, from Mexico to South America," and which now "had started the fire of hatred and persecution in Spain." Quick measures had to be taken lest it spread, said the Pope, ending with a blessing on "all those who have undertaken the difficult and dangerous task to defend and reinstate the honour of God and religion."¹¹

This was the beginning of a world-wide Catholic offensive against Republican Spain. Bishops in Italy, Germany, and other countries published pastoral letters urging Catholics to help the fight against Bolshevism. The Pope spoke again. The Spanish Civil War, he said, was a foretaste of what "is being prepared for Europe and the world unless the nations take appropriate measures against it."¹²

Mussolini sent thousands of troops, all duly blessed by the Italian hierarchy. Hitler sent warplanes, warships, tanks, technicians, and soldiers. The help given by the two Fascist dictators at this stage can be gauged by the official figures published in 1951 by none other than the American State Department, in a 951-page volume entitled *Germany and the Spanish Civil War*.¹³

The documents give specific details of all the planes, guns, Italian divisions, and the German Condor Legion. Hitler spent \$200,000,000. Mussolini's intervention cost him 1,000 airplanes, 6,000 lives among 100,000 troops, and fourteen

billion lire. Without Nazi and Italian help, the documents show, Franco's cause would have been lost on several occasions.

This was not only the objective conclusion of a sober, matter-of-fact American Commission a decade after the event; it was the conclusion of one who should have known: Adolf Hitler. "Without Italian and German aid, Franco would not exist today," declared the Fuehrer in 1940.

In addition to all this, legions of Catholic volunteers, inspired and organized by the Church, were sent from many countries at the same time as the Vatican was promoting a most unscrupulous campaign of vilification, hatred, and diplomatic intrigues throughout the world. Thus she was determined to influence the Foreign Offices of the various European and American democracies, and even the League of Nations. The South American Republics were urged to vote, and did vote, against non-intervention and in favour of embargo on shipment of arms to the Republicans. This move was preceded and followed by similar ones in Republican France, and in Protestant England, whose Foreign Office—supported by the U.S.A.—conceived, proposed, and carried out this most fatal policy, as the most calculated plan to help Catholic Franco win the war.

This, it should be noted, while the Republican Government was denied goods, armaments, and men (the real volunteers who had flocked from many nations to its help were finally stopped), and was abandoned by all her friends, including Soviet Russia, who, after small help at the beginning, withdrew altogether from the scene.

Notwithstanding such tremendous odds, the Spanish people fought a relentless, bitter fight from 1936 until 1939.

The outcome of the scandalous procedure of Vatican and Western diplomacy in supplying the Catholic rebels with unlimited moral, political, and military support, while denying the most dire necessities to the legally elected Republican Government, was bound to have but one result: the Republic was defeated.

The Pope sent a special message to the Catholic victors:

With great joy we address you, dearest sons of Catholic Spain, to express our paternal congratulations for the gift of peace and victory with which God has chosen to crown the Christian heroism of your

faith. . . . We give you, our dear sons of Catholic Spain, our apostolic benediction.¹⁴

Thereupon, after having repeatedly stated that God should be thanked—"for once more the hand of Divine Providence has manifested itself over Spain"—while prominent Spaniards filled Franco's jails, were tried, executed, and others sent into exile, many voluntarily refusing "to be associated with that regime of assassins and of tonsured asses,"¹⁵ the Vicar of Christ, during a ceremony when the flags of many nations were being paraded before him, approached Franco's flag and kissed it; the only one to be accorded such a distinction.

Franco's flag had truly well deserved Papal predilection. For the new Spain was soon transformed into the model Catholic State, expounded in the Papal encyclicals, after democracy, "that pernicious rule by the people," had been overthrown not by the ballot, but by the bullet.

In the new State, Catholicism was declared the only religion. From the elementary schools to the universities, its teaching was made compulsory. Divorce became anathema, abortion a crime, birth control punishable.

Church property and all medieval privileges of the Church were restored. No other religion was allowed. Protestants were persecuted, their places of worship were closed; pastors were imprisoned or expelled from the country. No Bible was permitted free circulation; non-Catholic books were confiscated or burned; the strictest censorship of literature and newspapers was enforced. Children of Protestant parents were forced to worship the image of the Virgin Mary. In many places, to procure employment attendance at Mass became compulsory.¹⁶ Protestants and ex-Catholics were sent to concentration camps for refusing to attend divine service. Free-thinkers, Democrats, Socialists, and Communists were deprived of civil rights or imprisoned. Political parties, trade unions, co-operatives were suppressed; the Corporate System enforced. Only one party was allowed. The Spanish version of the storm-troops was created.

In the foreign field, Catholic Spain promptly supported Mussolini and Hitler:

I consider as you yourself do, that the destiny of history has united you with myself and the Duce in an indissoluble way,

Catholic Franco wrote to Hitler on February 26, 1941.

We stand today where we have always stood, in a resolute manner and with the firmest conviction,

he added. Therefore, he concluded,

you must have no doubts about my absolute loyalty to this political concept and to the realization of the union of our national destinies with those of Germany and Italy.¹⁷

And, after having hunted down the enemies of the Church within Spain, he did the same abroad by sending his anti-Bolshevik legion, the Blue Division, to fight side by side with the Nazi armies on the Russian Front.

Catholic Spain had destroyed the Church's foes with the help of God, Franco once declared after hearing Mass. Our battle against them "will always be to our advantage, since they are against God and we are his soldiers."¹⁸

That is why "this nation, being a defender of truth, deserves the support of God," declared the Archbishop of Toledo; and therefore she represents "a triumph of religion and of the spirit," added Pope Pius XII.¹⁹

Franco was a firm believer in a Catholic God. But having observed during the Civil War how Italian and German guns had played a not inconsiderable role in supplementing the somewhat dubious assistance of an otherwise Catholic Providence, he made sure, after the crushing of the Republic, with a most un-Catholic practicality, that God's support promised him by the Spanish hierarchy be given concreteness by way of a Spanish equivalent of the Nazi storm-troops—i.e. the Falange.

In 1940 this body received a subsidy of 10,000,000 pesetas. By 1946 the subsidy had grown to 1,535,652,000 pesetas. The Falange was supplemented by the "Somantes," groups of armed civilians under State control, in addition to an army of 1,000,000 men. By 1951-2, seventy-five per cent of Spain's Budget was allocated to military expenditure. In contrast to this, only five per cent was assigned to education. Super-Catholic Spain by 1951 was housing the incredible figure of 5,200,000 illiterates in a population of 28,000,000 people, twenty-five per cent more than under the "diabolical" Republic.²⁰ Most of these huge sums, ironically enough, were

paid by a democratic country which, more ironically still, had become the most devoted Protestant supporter of the Vatican—namely, the U.S.A., which on August 28, 1951, gave a grant, the first of many, of 62,500,000 dollars, followed by another of 100,000,000 dollars—and the signing of a military pact between the U.S.A. and Spain—all this to maintain in power that pious killer of Spanish democracy, Catholic Franco.

A somewhat puzzling demonstration of a tactless lack of confidence in a Catholic Providence, worthy of the most villainous miscreant, on the part of a Catholic General, a son of that Church which so prides herself on her capability to mobilize both the Creator of the Universe and all his heavenly hosts to support her political machinations.

It was in this manner that the iron fist of yet another Catholic dictatorship was permitted once more to foil and to continue to thwart all the nobler aspirations of a brave and most proud nation.

Yet, from the very beginning, Franco's malefic work had already been predestined to tumble ignominiously into the dust.

It could not be otherwise, for truly that is the inescapable destiny reserved to all the violators of the will of the people, the ultimate annihilator of all ancient and modern tyrannies.

THE VATICAN AGAINST THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

GIANTS ACT LIKE GIANTS, HENCE their undertakings are on a gigantic scale. Years are reckoned by decades, decades by centuries. Geographical areas are made to embrace nations or even continents, while the histories of institutions and of races are seen in perspectives not easily comprehended. Because of this, their actions, being in harmony with their extraordinary magnitude, will escape the notice of individuals unable to size up the vast historical panoramas which, although clearly scrutinizable by retinas of gigantic forms, yet are partly blurred and often wholly invisible to others.

The Catholic Church, the greatest surviving giant in the world, is a colossus with no peer in antiquity, experience, and, above all, in her determination to dominate the human race. To reach such a goal, she will suffer no rivals, tolerate no competitors, put up with no enemies.

Giants who, like her, were found roaming in the deep valley of history, she fought with bloody claws and a ruthlessness to shame the Attilas, the Genghis Khans, and all the other scourgers of civilization. Many she led to their destruction; others she subjugated for good; some were annihilated, but

some resisted and escaped all her guiles. More than one survived, and even fought relentless battles that echoed with sanguinary echoes in the corridors of the centuries and that are still being fought as ferociously as in olden times, now, in the very midst of the twentieth century.

Vatican diplomacy is the oldest diplomacy in the world. Most of those it fought were either shrunk to nothing by time or blotted out by history, and to modern ears all its multifarious intrigues would sound as hollow and as unreal as they have become strangely unrelated to the ever-bewildering events of our day.

Yet not all the ancient foes of the Vatican have been reduced to mere landmarks of the past. Some have bridged bygone centuries to the present, and one of them, the most formidable of all, the Orthodox Church, a peer to Catholicism in antiquity, is as much a reality in our time as is the Vatican itself.

The antagonism of these two ancient colossi has produced the longest diplomatic war in the history of man, which is still being fought as fiercely, as ruthlessly, and as unscrupulously as ever. Catholic intrigues against Orthodoxy, since its inception, are uncountable. They fill the annals of the first millennium; and from the beginning of the second, when in 1054 the Orthodox Patriarch, Michael Cerulanius, brought about the final breach between the Eastern and Western Churches, until the fall of Constantinople, they remained paramount in the history of medieval Europe.

The goal of this thousand-year war is simple: the destruction or subjugation of the Orthodox Church or its voluntary or forcible integration into the Catholic Church. The unscrupulousness of Vatican diplomacy to reach this objective, prior to and after the fall of Byzantium, is hardly matched by parallel exertions in history, its most blatant intrigues of the period being veritable masterpieces of diplomatic cunning and double-dealing. Councils, religious compromises, political bargaining, secret negotiations with Orthodox Patriarchs, pacts with the Byzantine Emperors—everything and every device was used at one time or another to put Orthodoxy in fetters. E.g. the pact struck with the last Orthodox Emperor of Con-

stantinople, who, to obtain a promise of help in the defence of the Orthodox capital against the gathering Mahommedan armies, pledged to the Vatican the mass conversion of the Orthodox Church.

From the smashing of the Orthodox Church's political pillar, the Byzantine Empire, in 1453, to the crumbling of its political successor, the Russian Czarist Empire, in 1917, the Vatican-Orthodox relations were characterized by a period of comparative diplomatic lull. This was due to historical factors, the most outstanding of which was that, in the course of the centuries, the centre of Orthodoxy had shifted *en masse* from the Near East to the West, where its former missionary lands became its new home—namely, to Holy Russia. There the Orthodox Church struck deep roots. More than that: as Rome had been the first Rome, Constantinople had been the "second Rome," so now Moscow became the "third Rome." Moscow, Philothei said in the fifteenth century, was the natural successor of Constantinople. And now that Constantinople had fallen, the only Orthodox Empire left in the world was the Russian. The Russian nation alone, therefore, henceforward became the true repository of the Orthodox Faith. The idea of an Orthodox Empire became the Russian's paramount idea. Church and State were integrated, linked by a common messianic purpose. Having found such fertile soil, soon the Orthodox Church regained its old vigour and splendour. And, as of old, committing its ancient mistake, it identified itself as intimately with the Russian Empire as it had previously done with the Byzantine. From about 1721, when Peter the Great, after his Spiritual Regulation, made the Orthodox Church a branch of Czarism, until the Bolshevik Revolution, Caesaro-popism made her invincible against the machinations of the Vatican and almost impregnable to its attack on the religious, diplomatic, and political fronts. Her immense strength, however, was her fatal weakness, as the fall of Czarism would automatically entail the fall of the Orthodox Church—which, in fact, occurred in 1917.

From then onward the machinations of Vatican diplomacy were resumed with renewed vigour wherever Orthodoxy existed—in the Balkans, in Russia, in North-east Europe, and, indeed, even in the Near East.

Catholic instruments used to hamper, undermine, boycott, and subjugate the Orthodox Church have been extremely varied, ranging from converted White Russians to Turkish officers, beginning and ending with diplomatic or political intrigues of all kinds, as can easily be imagined.

A typical case occurred after the First World War, when the fortunes of war put the fate of Constantinople in the balance. Immediately following the outbreak of hostilities, Lloyd George, Zaharoff, and Premier Venezelos of Greece, signed an agreement by which the Greeks were to get the former Orthodox capital. This provoked a storm of protest from various quarters. The strongest, however, did not come from any Western State, but from the Vatican. The British Government, with whom the final decision rested, became the particular target of Papal displeasure. Constantinople should never be ceded to the Orthodox Church, was the Vatican's request. This was tactfully ignored. Thereupon, Catholic diplomacy having looked elsewhere for support, soon found an unexpected ally in an unexpected quarter, a Turkish officer by the name of Kemal, who in no time dispelled Rome's anxiety by a brilliant victory at Smyrna. Kemal's victory precluded any possibility of Greece getting the ancient Orthodox capital.

Kemal Ataturk was not slow to perceive that identification of the interests of the young Turkey and of the Vatican could be mutually beneficial, and a tacit but real alliance was unofficially agreed upon. The fruits that it bore were various. They ranged from the heavy punishment and even death of any Turkish soldier found harming Armenian Christians, to the granting of special privileges to the Catholic Church in Turkish territory. But, in the eyes of Rome, its paramount result was that the Orthodox Church had been prevented from returning to its ancient seat.

As long as an independent Turkish nation existed, Constantinople, by remaining incorporated in it, would never pass to her. The new Turkish Republic, therefore, must survive and prosper. Following this strategy, the curious spectacle of the Vatican supporting a Moslem nation ruled by an Atheist dictator became a discreet feature of Catholic diplomacy. Kemal Pasha, in gratitude for the unofficial pressure exerted in his favour by Catholic diplomacy in many European quarters,

maintained a tacit understanding with the Vatican throughout his tenure of office; an alliance, this, which, although almost unnoticed, yet more than once stultified various conflicting interests in the Middle East.

Kemal Ataturk, who had been the instrument of "a great victory for the Pope," as the *Osservatore Romano* triumphantly put it, commenting upon Kemal's military victory at Smyrna, a decade or so later became the instrument of a second, which symbolically was even more significant.

The centre of the Orthodox Church since the foundation of the Byzantine Empire of Constantine the Great in A.D. 324 has been the great Church of St. Sophia, which for over a millennium had come to symbolize Orthodoxy perhaps even more than St. Peter's in Rome symbolizes the Mother Church of Catholicism. From St. Sophia the Orthodox Patriarchs ruled almost like Popes of the East, until the fall of Constantinople. After the fall, notwithstanding the shifting of the centre of Orthodoxy, St. Sophia continued to be the greatest symbol of Orthodoxy: a link bridging her past with the present, and her present with a future when St. Sophia would become once more the Mother Church of all Orthodox the world over.

Such a dream, however, was soon to be shattered, at least for a comparatively short period, when in 1935 Kemal, in one of his boldest steps to modernize Turkey, converted St. Sophia into a museum of Romano-Byzantine-Christian and Ottoman-Muslim art. The humiliation of the centre of Orthodoxy could not have been more bitter.

A thing worthy of notice is that, prior to Ataturk's decision, the Vatican was informally consulted about any possible objections to St. Sophia's transformation. The Vatican, which thunders so promptly whenever a nation threatens to secularize Catholic schools or churches, not only did not object, but actually tacitly approved and even encouraged Kemal in his scheme.

It was thus that, when finally the muezzin, having climbed the minarets of St. Sophia, called in echoing accents to the faithful for the last time and the great building became officially a museum, whereas in the East the Moslems exculpated themselves to Allah for the sacrilege and the Orthodox world

heard of the change with a heavy heart, at the Vatican there were smiles. Enigmatic, it is true, but very clear to those who understood the secret code of diplomacy.

If the first upheaval created by the First World War had enabled the Vatican to score a significant victory against the Orthodox Church, that same world had unexpectedly opened up a tremendous vista of conquests for Catholic diplomacy by causing the simultaneous thunderous fall of two great empires which until then had partially dominated both the East and the West—i.e. the Turkish and the Russian Empires. This meant not only the tumbling of two massive political units, but also—and for the Vatican this had an even more significant meaning—the tumbling of the Caliphate as the supreme head of Islam, and of the Czar as the supreme head of the Orthodox Church.

The downfall of Czarism, in addition to being a political event of the first magnitude, spelt the disintegration of the power of the Orthodox Church, centred in the person of the Czar.

The centralization of political-religious power, by binding both, meant that the downfall of one would spell the downfall of the other. Which is precisely what occurred. The Russian Revolution consequently, by sweeping away Czarism, swept away also the established Orthodox Church. The latter fell, not only because of her ties with the civil power, but also owing to the intrinsic dead-weight which she had grown within herself. The Orthodox Church, in fact, had become a formidable reactionary power in her own right, whose economic tentacles spread to every nook and cranny of Holy Russia, controlling with an iron grip the minds and bodies of its inhabitants. She had over 80,000 churches and chapels and an army of 120,000 priests, supplemented by thousands of monasteries and convents, inhabited by another 100,000 monks and nuns. She controlled enormous wealth in land and buildings, owning 20,000,000 acres of the richest land and, at the time of the outbreak of the Revolution, a bank balance of eight billion roubles and an income of about 500,000,000 roubles a year.

Her influence was truly enormous and was at the service of the Czar, whose absolutism was further advocated by priests who took to politics. Without mentioning the monk Rasputin, the clergy sent to Parliament were of the most reactionary kind. The Third Duma saw forty-five priests, none of whom belonged to the Liberal party; the next Duma had forty-eight, forty of whom represented the most reactionary movements. Whenever there were elections, the Orthodox Church supported the Czar and preached against any social or political reform.

The Bolshevik Revolution, when it came, swept away this formidable tool of reaction as ruthlessly as it did Czarism. The immense Church property was nationalized, schools were requisitioned, the clergy were brought to political impotence: in short, the separation of Church and State was made a reality, and the Orthodox Church, despoiled of her magnificence, was reduced overnight to the naked poverty of early Christendom.

All these portents were followed with sinister fascination by the Roman Curia. When, therefore, in 1917 the Bolsheviks took over, at the Vatican, incredible as it may seem, there was jubilation. If the Bolsheviks were a terrible menace, they were also a blessing in disguise. Had they not pulled down the Orthodox Church, Rome's seemingly immovable rival? Had they not become the instruments for her approaching total disintegration?

The Russian Revolution had thus opened for the Vatican an immense field for Catholic conquest. A bold policy might result in what Catholicism had attempted in vain for over one thousand years: the reunion of the Orthodox Church, via a mass conversion of the Russians, in addition to the spiritual incorporation of Bulgaria, Rumania, Serbia, the Polish Orthodox Ukrainians, and all the other different Orthodox groups in Eastern Europe—in fact, practically the whole Orthodox world. Orthodox resistance against the Soviets found no sympathy whatsoever in Rome. On the contrary, it was welcomed in the hope that, by defying the new atheistic government, the Church would be given a mortal blow and would be wiped out for good.

It was while waiting for the Orthodox Church to receive

the last blow that would finally bury her, and while the whole of Europe kept repeating, "This Lenin cannot last"—and by Lenin was meant Bolshevik Russia—that the Vatican unobtrusively made the first moves directed at attaining simultaneously its two main goals: acceleration of the stab in the back for what it believed to be an already moribund Orthodox Church, and its grandiose scheme for the mass conversion to Catholicism of the Orthodox millions.

Count Sforza, a leading figure in the Italian Foreign Office, was approached by Pope Benedict XV, via one of the Pope's most intimate confidants, and, under the seal of secrecy, was asked whether he would facilitate the entry of a number of Catholic priests into Russia. "Seeing my surprise," Count Sforza afterwards related,

Monti [the Pope's confidant] explained, and it was evident that he was repeating the very words of the Pope: "His Holiness thinks that even these crimes and this blood will one day be of service if it is going to be possible, when the wave of irreligion has passed, to attempt a Catholic evangelization in Russia. Orthodoxy no longer has any deep-rooted life; its end as the official religion offers possibilities which would never have existed so long as a Czar, Protector of the Church, continued to reign."¹

On receiving a favourable reply, on the orders of Benedict XV, "young priests began desperately studying Russian and the history of the Orthodox Church."¹ Catholics with Russian experience and Catholic Russians overnight became top counsellors, chief among these being a Russian diplomat who, besides having become converted to Catholicism, had been ordained a Catholic priest: Alexander Evreinow, who was often consulted by the leading figures of the Vatican Secretariat of State.

From Rome, Vatican activities spread towards Russia itself. Negotiations between Rome and Moscow continued with varying fortune, the Bolsheviks being seemingly bent on pursuing crafty tactics. Yet at the Vatican the hopes that its patient efforts would eventually be rewarded by the conversion of "a country of 90,000,000 people to the true religion" remained very bright. "The moment has arrived propitious for *rapprochement*" (between the Vatican and Moscow), wrote the *Osservatore Romano*, "inasmuch as the iron circle

of Caesaro-popism, which hermetically closed Russian religious life to all Roman influences, has been broken."

At this point one question might come to the fore, in view of subsequent events. Surely Vatican diplomacy could not possibly trust the promises of the Bolsheviks? And, if so, why did it go on negotiating? The answer is simple: the transactions were useful as preparatory ground for the eventual grand-scale conversion of Russia *after Bolshevik Russia had collapsed*.

For the key to Vatican diplomacy, then as now, was just this. It must be remembered that at that period expeditionary forces were being dispatched by various Western countries to kill the revolution; indeed, that Catholic Poland had invaded Russian territory, and that anti-Bolshevik armies, encouraged, sponsored, and supported by the West, were roaming inside and outside Bolshevik Russia, in attempts to bring about its early downfall. The Chancelleries of Europe were buzzing with plans and counter-plans of all kinds to bring nearer the blessed day.

The Vatican, consequently, based its moves on a possibility which at this period was practically a certainty for diplomatic Europe. "Actual political conditions [inside Russia] form a grave obstacle; but this obstacle," pontificated again the *Osservatore Romano*, "has a temporary character."

The climax of the Vatican-Bolshevik negotiations was reached in 1922, when the Conference of Genoa offered the most incredible spectacle of the Bolshevik Foreign Minister, Chicherin, and the Pope's representative, the Archbishop of Genoa, toasting one another in public. Vatican diplomacy thought it had scored a triumph, or, at least, was about to score one. Chicherin's "concessions," however, were but an amplification of the basic Soviet rule that, as the separation of Church and State was an accomplished fact, there was the amplest scope for any Church zealous of proselytizing. The Vatican, whose scheme remained immense, interpreted this as favourable to itself, and plans for the "Catholicizing of Russia" were put forward. These, however, soon incurred great difficulties, owing to the delaying Soviet tactics.

But what gave Vatican diplomacy a shock, and its under-

standing with the Soviets a matter of urgency, was that the Bolsheviks, giving a literal interpretation to their constitution, had applied religious freedom with equal impartiality to various Protestant bodies, which had meanwhile made soundings for the Protestant evangelization of the Russians. This was not all: Atheistic and anti-religious organizations of all kinds were also flourishing everywhere, sponsored by the State itself. But, still worse, the moribund Orthodox Church, instead of resignedly giving up the ghost, was still alive—indeed, was giving alarming signs of recovering.

The incursion of the Protestants into what the Vatican had envisaged as its exclusive field, but, above all, the ominous recovery of the Orthodox Church, convinced it that time was pressing. Vagueness had to be replaced by concrete action, to force the hand of the Soviets.

The Vatican changed its tactics. The phase of patient, secretive negotiations was over. That of the diplomatic mailed fist was initiated. This consisted of indirect pressure, via Catholic friendly or allied nations, upon whomsoever Vatican diplomacy decided to attack.

A Papal messenger arrived at the Genoa Conference. He bore a missive whose content was simple. It asked the Powers not to sign any treaty whatsoever with Bolshevik Russia unless "freedom to practise any religion" was guaranteed. Freedom, the Vatican explained to the Soviet representative at this juncture, meant complete freedom "for the Catholic Church." With regard to the other Christian denominations (Protestant and Orthodox), the Vatican would not object to any "restrictive" measures that the Soviets might take against their exertions. Previous to this, the Vatican had made sure of the support of some of the countries participating in the Conference by discreetly "briefing" Catholic and anti-Communist representatives assembled there.

The Vatican's efforts ended in nothing, the Genoa Conference having failed.

In 1927 the last semi-direct attempts at agreement between the Vatican and Moscow took place. The Vatican declared its dissatisfaction with "the Soviet proposals," and relations with Moscow were broken off for good.

.

Something of paramount importance which, more than anything else, made the Vatican adopt another diplomatic policy had meanwhile occurred.

The Orthodox Church, although still stunned by the 1917 blow, had rapidly adapted herself to the changed situation. The separation of Church and State, which the Vatican had reckoned would kill her, had turned out to be a more invigorating factor than her former identification with the government which had caused her downfall. Orthodoxy, in fact, had begun to reorganize itself, and in the religious domain had already almost recovered its former strength.

In these conditions, the original grandiose scheme of the Vatican had become obsolete. The policy of conversion was therefore discarded and a new one adopted. This rested upon the forcible overthrow of Soviet Russia via military attack.

The original plan, based upon the formula that the Soviet regime was of a "temporary character," was readopted. The various Foreign Offices of the world were still conceiving different schemes for the overthrow of the Bolsheviks. Had these succeeded, the Catholic Church would have penetrated Russia in their wake.

It became increasingly evident, however, that to base a whole strategy upon this kind of "intervention" was to pursue an increasingly unrealistic policy. And within a few years, although the plan was once more discreetly dropped, it was nonetheless promptly replaced by another, no less grandiose: the total mobilization of the West against Soviet Russia, to be carried out, no longer by direct military intervention, but by an ideological and emotional anti-Bolshevik crusade, preparatory to an eventual physical attack.

The scheme soon became a reality, thanks to the timely growth of a most sinister political portent: Fascism, whose fundamental policy was war against Communism. The Vatican, which had already concluded an alliance with its original founder, supported similar movements everywhere it could, with a view to converting the whole of Europe into a monolithic anti-Bolshevik *bloc*. Its ultimate objective: a military invasion of Russia.

By 1930-31 the West had already been "emotionally roused to war against Godless Russia." Only three years afterwards,

Hitler, having gone into power, began to voice his ambition of acquiring the Ukraine; three more years, and the Anti-Comintern Pact was signed between Nazi Germany and Japan (1936). Russia was being swiftly enclosed in an iron ring, from the West and from the East. Two more years, and the first surrender of Europe to Hitler was made at Munich (1938), when the four Powers—two Fascist Dictatorships, Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, on the one side, and two Democracies, England and France, on the other—tried to settle the fate of Europe by sacrificing Czechoslovakia at the altar of appeasement. It was the Vatican which, during this crisis, specifically asked the British Premier, Chamberlain, to exclude Russia from the Conference. This at a time when Great Britain was seeking a pact with Russia, to strengthen her bargaining weight against Hitler. The exclusion proved fatal. Hitler emerged wholly victorious, and the Second World War was made inevitable.

In the following year Hitler occupied the whole of Czechoslovakia. During the Finnish War in 1939 Great Britain and France, with the Vatican in the background, instigated the expulsion of Soviet Russia from the League of Nations, and, in close co-operation with the Vatican, mobilized world opinion against her, speaking of this campaign as a crusade.

Two years later the Vatican's grand strategy bore its fruit. Hitler, backed by the might of a Nazified European continent, attacked Soviet Russia. The grandiose vistas dreamed of at the fall of the Czar were dreamed of once more, to the chanting of hallelujas in St. Peter's. The Institute Pro Russia, in Rome, which had been languishing for so long, now pulsated with feverish activity,² and Catholics were urged to renew their devotions to Our Lady of Fatima. Yes, the promise of the Virgin, so curiously in harmony with the Vatican's grand scheme, at long last was coming true.

Within a few months, the Nazi armies had reached the outskirts of Moscow, Leningrad, and Stalingrad. Soviet Russia was about to be destroyed.

The Nazi armies and the Catholic legions fighting by their side, after their initial triumph, were hammered back. And ultimately, to the horror of the Vatican, it was the Russians who entered Berlin and not Hitler who entered Moscow.

Vatican diplomacy had received yet another resounding defeat. But even before this had been completed, with its typical suppleness it had already launched yet another anti-Bolshevik, anti-Orthodox grand scheme, in co-operation with a new partner, which was even more powerful than its former Nazi ally—i.e. the United States of America. The new campaign had been launched while the guns of the Second World War were still echoing in the battlefields of both Europe and Asia, and the people of the world were looking forward with a prayer in their hearts to an era of tranquillity and peace.

As, after the First World War, Vatican diplomacy operated simultaneously a many-branched anti-Soviet strategy, so, after the Second, it launched another, no less formidable than the first.

The ultimate objective being the same, fundamentally its policy remained the same. In addition to its new main partners, playing the role of Nazi Germany *vis-à-vis* Soviet Russia, new tactical moves directed at implementing it were carefully studied and carried out. These, although seemingly disconnected, in reality were closely knit into an inter-continental pattern embracing the whole world.

The principal tactical features of this new strategy took the form of: (a) mobilization of the Catholics of the Near East; (b) mobilization of the Orthodox Church outside Russia; (c) mobilization of Islam; and (d) general intensification and speeding up of the ideological and military mobilization of the West.

These four types of political machination were carried out almost simultaneously, with a technique which was greatly different from that used after the First World War, when the Vatican, having failed to carry on its intrigues against the Orthodox Church *inside* Russia, had shifted its operations against her *outside* Russia—that is to say, in the Balkans.

After the second World War the Vatican began to mobilize all Catholics in the Near and Middle East.

It was thus that, as the various Balkan countries became sealed to Catholic diplomacy, the Vatican became increasingly active outside the Balkans—e.g. with the Chaldean Catholics,

mainly centred in Iraq; the Maronites in the Lebanon; the Copt-Catholics in Egypt; the Melkites, or Greek Catholics, and others to be found in practically all these territories, as well as in Syria, Transjordan, and Palestine.

Simultaneously with this, it approached the Orthodox Church outside the Communist world with a view to inducing it to side with the Vatican, or, at least, with the Vatican's political allies in their anti-Russian, anti-Communist wars.

Unofficial negotiations were initiated, but, owing mainly to Orthodoxy's deep-rooted suspicion of the Vatican, these yielded very little result. Indeed, it looked as though they would prevent any real *rapprochement* altogether.

Vatican diplomacy waited for a while and then resorted to a master move. It sent to the Middle East, no longer Catholic diplomats, but the envoy of the two most powerful men in the West: Mr. Myron Taylor, the representative of the President of the U.S.A., and simultaneously, on this particular mission, representative of the Pope *vis-à-vis* the Orthodox leaders whom he went to meet.

It was thus that, at the beginning of February, 1949, when the cold war against Russia was at its height, Myron Taylor arrived at Istanbul, where, in his dual capacity, he met the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras.

Mr. Taylor put forward concrete plans for the co-operation of the Orthodox and Catholic Churches, in the face of the "Communist threat to religion," at the same time trying to ascertain the "true" current status of the Orthodox Churches in Communist-dominated countries, and the ways in which Communism might be using these Churches to strengthen its position in Eastern Europe and in Near-East areas. Having discussed such matters, both with the Orthodox leaders and with the Apostolic delegate in Turkey, Myron Taylor, to make his argument for Orthodox co-operation more convincing, stated in no doubtful terms that the "co-operation" of Orthodoxy was not only wished for by the Vatican but was "wanted" by the U.S.A. The whole point of the Vatican's choice of Myron Taylor, the representative of the American President, to meet the Eastern Orthodox leaders, was to lay emphasis precisely on this.

It was the trump card of Vatican diplomacy, so well screened behind the American envoy. For it must be remembered that Greece, where the Orthodox Church was at its strongest, had been saved by America from becoming a Communist country only a short while before. Following the end of the Second World War, a bloody civil war between Right and Left devastated Greece for several years. Great Britain poured in troops to reinforce the anti-Communist faction. The Left, however, owing chiefly to the support of the population, was near to winning, and the U.S.A. had to intervene.

Military and financial aid was rushed to the country. The Left was defeated. Extreme Right-Wing forces were installed in power. Throughout the civil war and the British and American intervention, the Orthodox Church played a paramount role. Indeed, at one time the Greek Orthodox Patriarch became head of the Greek Government.

The Orthodox Church, having identified itself with the Right and with the American interventionists, consequently had the support of the Greek Government, sponsored by the U.S.A. Withdrawal of American protection would have meant the fall of the Right-Wing Greek Government, in which case the fate of the Greek Orthodox Church would have been precisely a repetition in miniature of the fate of the Russian Orthodox Church on the fall of the Czar.

The dispatch of the American envoy as the Vatican's representative, with his emphasis on the American desire to see the co-operation of the Orthodox Church, was political blackmail of the first water which the Vatican had accomplished by using political, non-Catholic pressure.

Precisely one year later the mission bore its first real fruit. In February, 1950, His Beatitude the Patriarch Cristoforos of Alexandria arrived in Athens to prepare with Archbishop Spiridon, head of the Orthodox Church in Greece, for an event of the greatest significance: the summoning of a Pan-Orthodox Synod.

The new Synod, once translated into less directly theological terms, meant a political council of the Orthodox Churches to keep step with the anti-Communist war of their protector, the U.S.A.

The Orthodox Church within the Communist regions

countered soon afterwards, when Patriarch Alexei of Moscow "extended" the Russian Church's jurisdiction to include Hungary (March, 1950).

This was followed by a counter-blow from the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States, which announced that it had officially broken all ties with the Orthodox Church of Moscow. Metropolitan Bishop Krimowicz, of Springfield, Mass., was appointed Patriarch of the Orthodox Church in the United States, and Metropolitan Bishop Jaroshevich Patriarch of the Orthodox Church in foreign countries (October, 1950). In December, 1951, Metropolitan Leonty, the Orthodox Church's U.S. Primate, and the Bishops of Alaska and San Francisco, invested a one-time officer of the Czarist army as the first Orthodox Bishop of Washington.³

Moves and counter-moves followed one another in quick succession in the years that followed, until the bridges were totally burnt on either side.

The Orthodox Church had been split asunder, one part, the larger, in Soviet Russia, the centre of the Communist world, the other in the U.S.A., the centre of Western Capitalism.

Division means weakness. The Vatican had manoeuvred its opponent where it had planned to manoeuvre it, in readiness for reducing further its unity and thus bringing nearer its ultimate downfall.

.

Simultaneously with these moves, Vatican diplomacy was busy setting in motion one of the greatest religious-political forces in the world, Islam. Islam, the historic enemy of Christianity, had always loomed large in Vatican diplomacy's plans against the Orthodox Church.

Cautious unofficial exchanges between the Vatican and various Arab countries, particularly the most influential Islamic country in the Middle East, Egypt, were begun in the years that followed the Second World War. These bore exceptional results. In 1946 an Arab delegation, composed of Christians and Moslems, paid an official visit to the Pope, and in 1947 the Moslem East made its first official approach to the Vatican. Egypt exchanged representatives with the Pope, and sent to Rome a Minister Plenipotentiary. Other Moslem countries—

e.g. Syria, the Lebanon, Iran—followed Egypt's example, and soon even those Moslem lands which had not yet officially exchanged diplomats were unofficially in close touch with Rome.

The Vatican's mobilization of the Islamic world culminated in 1950, when the Egyptian Foreign Minister, Salah ed Din, disclosed that Egypt and the Vatican had been conducting secret negotiations and had agreed upon the establishment of a "united Roman Catholic-Moslem front against Communism."⁴

The following year, Azzam Pasha, Secretary-General of the Arab League, went to Rome for a whole week, where he saw the Pope and other Vatican dignitaries: "The time has come for us to collaborate loyally, both as a nation and a religious entity, in the rebirth of a common patrimony," he declared, speaking on Radio Rome, "and in . . . the creation of a united front between Islam and Christianity against Communism."⁵

The foundations of a Catholic-Islamic partnership had been skilfully laid by Vatican diplomacy. From then onwards, particularly during 1951-2, and in spite of many vicissitudes, it continued to be solidified, to the present day. Islam is a potentially formidable religious-political unit. Whoever succeeds in exerting even a partial influence upon it will wield a power capable of provoking political and social repercussions in many strategically important parts of the world. From Spanish and French Morocco to Egypt, Persia, Pakistan, Indonesia, indeed, to within the very Soviet Union itself, housing 25,000,000 Moslems, as well as within Communist China, housing another 50,000,000.

The potentialities of the Moslem world as a formidable anti-Communist, anti-Russian, religious-political instrument, did not escape the attention of another anti-Communist power, the U.S.A. The American mobilization of the Islamic countries had been initiated by Roosevelt himself, who, just before his death (1945), had envisaged meeting Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia, King Farouk of Egypt, and others, for the amalgamation of the Near and Middle East into the framework of American global foreign policy.

Since then, Vatican-American interests ran ever closer, until,

within a few brief years, they were transformed into a veritable Vatican-American alliance. The material might of the U.S.A. and the spiritual power of the Catholic Church, by mobilizing the religious influence of Islam and the political energies of the Arab world, had encircled Soviet Russia in a religious-political iron ring, the precursor of a military one.

Its objective: for the U.S.A., the destruction of a mighty ideological and economic enemy; for the Catholic Church, the destruction, not only of Communism, but of Soviet Russia, the new protector of her religious rival, the Orthodox Church.

In bygone centuries the Vatican schemed stubbornly and tirelessly with the Turkish Empire, with the Austrian Empire, with Moslem, Buddhist, and other potentates, to bring about the downfall of Czarist Russia, so as to weaken the Orthodox Church.

In the twentieth century it schemed with equal pertinacity with the Europe which arose after the First World War, with Fascism and Nazism before and during the Second, in order, by causing the downfall of Soviet Russia, to paralyse a regenerated Orthodoxy.

After the Second World War it continued in its relentless scheming with the U.S.A., with a "dollarized" Europe, with the Arab nations and other Asiatic countries, to annihilate the U.S.S.R., in order, once again, to subjugate its Orthodox rival.

Catholic scheming, it should never be forgotten, has for its ultimate objective, not only the annihilation of an ideological enemy, represented by Soviet Russia, but also the annihilation of a religious foe, which the Catholic Church is more determined than ever to reduce to total subjugation and, indeed, to wipe from the face of the earth: the ever-resurgent Orthodox Church, the millennarian enemy she has sworn either wholly to absorb or wholly to demolish and destroy.

17

THE VATICAN AGAINST PROTESTANTISM

THE DICTUM THAT OLD RELIGIOUS factions are like burned-out volcanoes, and hence that ancient religious hatreds are dead, is not only erroneous, it is a dangerous fallacy.

To believe, therefore, that the enmity of the Catholic Church towards Protestantism is a thing of the past, or that the Catholic Church, while still waging war against her Orthodox rival, is at peace with all other Christian denominations, is as unreal as to believe that she no longer considers herself the unique bearer of truth and all other credences heretical, **m**ichievous, and false.

Ancient Catholic odium against Protestantism is still there, potent, dynamic, and as mercilessly ready to attack as ever. The temper of the West would no longer permit an open resumption of the old Catholic-Protestant conflicts, nor could the Catholic Church act with either success or impunity in a society where the principle of religious freedom is loudly proclaimed and practised.

But to believe that the Catholic Church is no longer her former self because of a sudden radical change of heart is dangerous.

Her present superficial tolerance is derived from a mixture of forcibly and voluntarily accepted factors, mostly beyond her control. Besides modern society having compelled her to accept religious tolerance, motives of her own have persuaded her to accept and even to befriend Protestantism: among these the rise of powerful contemporary hostile ideologies and the furtherance of some of her own political schemes. These last two are so closely inter-related that the necessity of opposing the former and of advancing the latter has compelled the Catholic Church to side with those very religious opponents whom, not so long ago, she would have unhesitatingly burned for theologically dissenting from her.

Complementary to the above, other no less powerful motives have contributed to Catholic "tolerance" of Protestantism; the fact that the most influential Western nations nominally are partly or wholly Protestant, that the most powerful of these, the U.S.A., has become the chief ally of the Vatican, and that the Vatican's financial budget has become a dollar budget, almost three-quarters of it coming, directly or indirectly, from the U.S.A. This has far more weight at the Vatican than is generally believed, and adds to the irony of history in so far as the Catholic Church is at present financially, politically, and even militarily wholly dependent upon Protestant lands; indeed, the mainstay of her global political strategy is Protestant U.S.A. Last but not least—and fundamentally, perhaps, the most powerful factor of all—is the fact that the Catholic Church has embarked upon an all-out effort at religious and political penetration of America, which it intends to capture from within. The shelving of Catholic anti-Protestant intolerance is due to these and certain other causes. Yet, in spite of the overwhelming reasons which compel the Catholic Church to pay lip-service to democratic freedom and hence to show a liberal attitude towards Protestantism, her ancient odium can still be seen at work.

To be sure, it is not made to operate on a large scale. It is not even systematic. It is uneven, haphazard, occasional, at times almost unrecognizable, but, just because of this, the more significant. The fire of Catholic hatred is still there, seemingly extinct because deceptively covered by a thick layer of ashes. For the incautious, that is the best proof that it has

gone out long ago. Yet, were its smouldering ashes to be even slightly disturbed, unexpected flames would leap up with the ferocity and the violence of old.

Contemporary Catholic tolerance of Protestantism is totally deceptive. If it is true that it has been imposed by modern man, it is also true that it has never been acknowledged by the Catholic Church as the genuine attitude of a regenerated Catholicism towards non-Catholic Christianity. On the contrary, the Catholic Church has remained as true to herself as ever. Certainly, her odium is not proclaimed from the house-tops, particularly those of Protestants, many of whom, urged by a common fear, have become her friends. Yet some of her words or deeds, more than significant, are indicative of her true attitude.

Prior to the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, for instance, Catholics talked openly of the renewal of a Catholic struggle against Protestantism, as openly as in the previous century. This was not the opinion of unauthoritative sources alone. The *Monde*, of Paris, at that time "the organ" of the Papal Nuncio, bluntly called the war a religious one against Protestantism. France had been assured by the Vatican that she had only to attack Protestant Prussia and all the Catholics of Southern Germany would join her. Without the miscalculation caused by these statements, it is not probable that the French would have been hurled into the ditch of Sedan. The cry, "the Church," raised by the Bavarian Catholic priests, not having, after all, proved as strong as that of "the Fatherland," raised by the patriots.

The Franco-Prussian War, labelled the war to "beat" Protestantism, cost Napoleon III his throne. It might be argued that the nineteenth century is not the twentieth, and that Catholicism has greatly changed since then. That is not only erroneous, it is a dangerous assumption. The twentieth century has blunted almost to extinction the Vatican's diplomatic anti-Protestant sting. Not sufficiently, however, to disprove that, had the Vatican the opportunity to give vent to its anti-Protestant hatred, it would still go to very great lengths to oppose Protestantism by every means, including the use of violence. The *Osservatore Romano* did not hesitate to publish a series of authoritative articles against Protestantism only a

few years ago.¹ Certain utterances from the Vatican in connexion with Protestantism can still assume a truly sinister significance—e.g. that of Cardinal Gasparri, Secretary of State to two Popes, Benedict XV and Pius XI. During the First World War, news reached the Vatican of the capture of Jerusalem from the Turks.

Cardinal Gasparri, while rejoicing at the news, for reasons we have already seen, after a moment of reflection became very serious. Asked the cause of such a sudden change, the Cardinal explained that the excellent news was spoiled by the fact that the liberation had been accomplished by a Protestant country: "It is to be regretted," were the Cardinal's words, "that the rescue should have been accomplished by a Power not of the true faith"—i.e. Britain.² These words, taken by themselves, are harmless enough. Yet, when uttered by the Vatican's Secretary of State, the moulder of Catholic political grand strategy, they assume a different significance. In his mouth they came to express the Vatican's regret that a Protestant country had done what the Catholic Church, even if indirectly through a Catholic Power, should have done. More than this, they came to signify the Vatican's determination, should the opportunity again arise, to urge a friendly Catholic State to eject Protestant England from Palestine and thus replace a Protestant by a Catholic flag.

Is this a far-fetched conclusion, purporting to prove that every Vatican dignitary's utterances are the expression of the darkest designs? The answer was given some twenty years later, openly, publicly, and enthusiastically, by the Italian hierarchy, with the blessing of the Vatican.

When Fascist Italy declared war upon Great Britain (June 10, 1940), Mussolini looked, not so much westwards as eastwards, to the Near and Middle East. The Duce was not alone. At the Vatican, eyes were also turned eastwards, and precisely to Palestine. The news of Jerusalem having been taken by a Protestant country, which had distressed Cardinal Gasparri, was remembered. His seemingly harmless regret that "a Power not of the true faith" was holding the Holy Land was at last translated into concrete political terms. Vatican policy, which until then had lain dormant, waiting for the right opportunity, was set in motion, and soon afterwards

several top hierarchs were discreetly "briefed" to sponsor a certain policy. The result was almost immediate. Thirty Italian bishops, supported by thousands of their clergy, sent a wire to Mussolini, urging—what? That he should "crown the unfailing victory of our army by planting the Italian flag [a Catholic flag] over the Holy Sepulchre."³ In other words, that he should eject Protestant England, the occupying Power, and replace her by Fascist Italy, a Catholic nation professing the true faith.

Protestant England was eventually ejected. Not, however, by Catholic Italy, but by the Jews. A Jewish State, Israel, the first since the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in the first century A.D. came into being. Vatican efforts had once more been nullified. But Vatican diplomacy, as always, resumed instantly its tireless exertions against the new controlling power, going so far as to mobilize the Catholic vote against Israel and recommending the internationalization of the Holy City within the United Nations, as we have already seen.

Here Vatican anti-Protestant exertions were confined almost exclusively to the diplomatic-political field and passed almost unnoticed. There are instances, however, although admittedly rare, when the Vatican can stage spectacular anti-Protestant opposition during which it employs all its political, diplomatic, ecclesiastical, religious, and spiritual pressure—e.g. that in connexion with the celebration of the commemoration of John Huss.

In 1924 the Czech Republic planned a great national ceremony in honour of the country's hero, John Huss. It so happened, however, that in her own good time the Catholic Church had burned Huss as a spreader of error. On hearing of the plan, the Vatican requested the Republic not to celebrate these festivities, which, it said, would amount to the glorification of a heretic. The celebrations would take place, the Czechs responded, whether the Vatican liked it or not.

The Vatican mobilized its diplomatic machinery, and the Papal Nuncio ordered the hierarchy to initiate a national campaign of protest against the commemoration. The order was duly obeyed. The vast organization of the Church was put into operation. The Government, any supporter of the celebrations, and, indeed, anybody who dared to defend the

memory and work of John Huss, were attacked and vituperated in the Press and radio, from the pulpits, in the Chamber of Deputies, day in and day out, to such an extent that finally the issue became the most dangerous religious, social, and political problem of the moment.

When at last the Church perceived that her attempt to dictate to the Czech Government was of no avail, Vatican diplomacy resorted to the direct weapon and openly blackmailed the Republic by threatening that, unless the celebrations were stopped, diplomatic relations would be cut off. As before, the Government would not be intimidated and, the threat having been ignored, continued its preparations for the anniversary. At this the Vatican took the unprecedented step of blatantly electing itself the supreme judge of the religious, political, and cultural independence of a sovereign, half-Protestant country, by ordering the Papal Nuncio in Prague officially to protest "against the offence given to the Catholic Church by the honouring of a heretic." This official protest having no effect, the Vatican, after further heightening the tension by a total mobilization of all its religious and political forces inside the Republic, at a certain moment staged a most melodramatic exit and instructed the Papal Nuncio to leave Prague (July, 1925).

The abandonment of a Papal nunciature, in the eyes of any government convinced, like the Czechs, of the absolute necessity of separation of Church and State, would not, in ordinary circumstances, have been a serious issue in itself. With a government contending with a vocally strong Catholic minority, however, the departure might have caused serious trouble and been enough to make any such government consider very carefully the pros and cons of an open breach with the Vatican. With a government contending with a strong, semi-autonomous, solidly knit, fervent, racial-religious group wholly dominated by the Catholic Church, such a diplomatic break on what had become seemingly only a religious issue was a case charged with the most nefarious possibilities. The Czech Government had to contend not only with a strong Catholic minority within Czechoslovakia, but with a semi-autonomous racial-religious group, upon whom the very preservation of national unity and, indeed, of national independence rested. This racial-religious group—i.e. the Slovaks—formed almost

one-third of Czechoslovakia. For a young Republic not yet one decade old to promote differences between the central government and Slovakia on religious problems was not only to emphasize profoundly the religious differences between one-third, the Catholic Slovaks, and the other two-thirds, the Protestant Czechs, but to split them also into racial, historical, cultural, and political fields. Failure to avert this rift within a State composed of different racial-religious groups would have meant ultimate disaster.

The departure of the Papal Nuncio from Prague, consequently, was not a dramatic but harmless gesture; it was a direct concrete threat on the part of the Vatican to the very existence of the Czech Republic.

The already smouldering fire of Slovak separatism was, from then onward, made to burn more fiercely, fanned periodically by the Vatican, until the Slovaks and the Czechs, seemingly only through racial and political antagonism, split asunder.

The paramount cause of their separation fundamentally was a religious one. It was this profound religious antagonism which, by contaminating with its intolerance the racial, cultural, social, and political behaviour of the Catholic Slovaks, finally brought about the disaster.

The controversy over the celebration of the commemoration of the "heretic" John Huss, with the departure of the Papal Nuncio, was one of the remote but real causes of the growing conflict between the Czechs and the Slovaks. Vatican diplomacy had initiated an all-out war against the "Hussite" country, destined to be crowned with complete success: the disintegration of the young Czechoslovakian Republic.

.

The rise of the great political ideologies of the twentieth century, besides having thwarted the Vatican's anti-Protestant diplomatic and political exertions, has also immensely restrained the Catholic Church from persecuting Protestants on purely religious grounds.

Notwithstanding this, however, the Catholic Church is still waging a subterranean, silent anti-Protestant war everywhere. Because its victories and defeats are not proclaimed to the sound of trumpets, it should not be taken for granted that this war

is not still potentially capable of turning into a major one.

That the Catholic Church of the twentieth century basically has not changed one iota from the Church of the past in her hatred of Protestantism could be proved *ad infinitum*: "It is necessary to insist on constant affirmation that right principles be spread abroad with every available means," said a leading cardinal in 1950. Reason? So that "ERRORS be uncovered at once and destroyed."⁴ That is the true contemporary attitude of Catholicism towards error—i.e. Protestantism.

Modern society does not permit Catholicism to translate such medieval intolerance into deeds. Yet Catholic pressure is constantly at work. Its weight, methods, and the means employed vary according to religious and political environment, so that Catholic hostility differs from place to place and from country to country.

It can vary from an antagonism which is almost indiscernible to the beating up of Protestants and the burning of their churches; from the tacit violation of a Constitution to the open proclamation that, where there is the Catholic religion there is no room for any other denomination.

In most nominally Catholic countries the Constitution openly proclaims religious freedom. Yet religious freedom is purposely violated. In Italy, for instance, the Catholic Church strove to impede Protestant growth by every legal and illegal means available. Although Italian Protestants (100,000) were theoretically guaranteed religious freedom by the Constitution, the Italian Government, dominated by the Catholic Party for many years following the Second World War, invoked old Fascist police laws to prevent Protestants from opening churches.⁵

The application of old Fascist laws, or the tacit violation of religious freedom, are supplemented by other hostile devices—e.g. the opening and strengthening of special religious or lay organizations by the Church to fight "Protestant proselytism" in, for instance, free schools established by English and American Methodists. One of these, the Irish Christian Brothers, waged such a successful war against Protestantism in Rome that by 1952 their language schools forced the closing of the "proselytizing schools" of the Protestants.

In another country the attack will be more direct—e.g. in

Chile, where in 1951 Chilean bishops issued a joint pastoral letter attacking Masons and Protestants, and warning all Catholics against proselytizing by Protestant evangelists, who "though divided into numerous sects are united in one thing—attacks on the Church and its teaching." In the Argentine the hierarchy, after giving similar advice, incited open boycott of Protestants. In Buenos Aires, meetings held by the Escuela Científica Basilio were interrupted by thousands of Catholics, organized by the hierarchy. The speakers were stopped by a crowd chanting, "Jesus is God," which afterwards went before the Archiepiscopal Palace, chanting the Credo, where they were addressed by the Auxiliary Bishop of Buenos Aires, Manuel Tato, who praised them for what they had done, saying that it was the duty of Catholics to attack the enemies of the Church, as they had done, wherever these appear.⁶

The degree of Catholic odium against Protestantism increases with the increase of Catholic power, a typical example of this being Franco's Spain.

In Spain, in 1952, the 20,000 Protestants were as spiritually isolated as heretics in the sixteenth century, and were socially confined to a veritable Protestant ghetto.⁷ They could not mark their churches, hold services even in private homes, name their chapels, conduct recreational clubs or parochial schools; they could not become teachers, lawyers, or army officers; indeed, it was almost impossible for them to get married. This was not all. Open boycott, compulsion, and persecution were conducted throughout Spain as far as prudent without arousing the outside world, particularly Protestant U.S.A. which, by 1951-2, had already poured into Franco's coffers hundreds of millions of dollars. Even so, the Spanish hierarchy did not hesitate to proclaim the existence of only one true religion, "dissidence" was not permitted, while non-Catholic denominations were tacitly and often openly treated as an evil. In 1949 their official publication, *Ecclesia*, came out with the declaration that "the objective right to profess a false religion does not exist." Protestant schools could not be established; Protestant children were compelled to attend classes where Catholic religious teaching was obligatory, State school-teachers being obliged to take them, with Catholic children, to Mass. A "religious assessor" censored every-

thing published in Spain connected with Protestantism at home *or abroad*. Protestants were forbidden to hold outdoor religious ceremonies or festivals.⁸

Catholic Spain, except when ruled by a Liberal or Left-Wing government, has always distinguished herself for her hatred towards Protestantism, and Protestant sympathizers have been stubbornly fined, boycotted, and sent to jail.

In Franco's Spain, as in any other country where Catholicism is in power, the Catholic mailed fist is openly employed, on the ground that God has given the Church the right to use force as a remedy against heresy:

We must say that material force is rightly employed to protect religion, to coerce those who disturb it . . . nay, that force can have no more noble use than this.⁹

Following words with deeds, the Church acted. In 1925, Don Felix Garcia was sentenced to three and a half years in jail simply for writing a critical article, "like a Protestant," on transubstantiation. In 1927 Doña Carmen Padin, a poor Protestant widow, was put on trial for repeating a Protestant blasphemy in a discussion with a neighbour—namely, that the Virgin Mary had borne children other than Jesus—and was sentenced to two years' penal servitude. In May, 1945, José Morado asked to be relieved from attending Mass, on the ground that he was not a Catholic. His request was not granted. At the moment of the elevation of the Host, when the bugler sounded the signal to kneel, J. Morado remained standing. He was imprisoned. On October 30, 1946, he was court-martialled for the offence of "disobedience to the sound of the bugle." The prosecutor asked that the indictment be the punishment of six years and one day in the penitentiary.¹⁰

During the Second World War and after, Protestant chapels were attacked and looted in various parts of Spain. When Fascist Franco's Spain became a full-blooded ally of the U.S.A., which by 1952 had supplied him with over 100,000,000 dollars, technicians, military experts, and war materials, "to save democracy and Christian civilization," Franco had to relax, although reluctantly, the strict laws against the Protestants.

In spite of the glaring fact that the 100,000,000 dollars already received to keep a Catholic dictatorship in being, and

the coming millions, were "Protestant dollars," the Spanish hierarchy could not pass over in silence the tiny concessions made by Franco, mostly for propaganda purposes.

A Catholic campaign against Protestantism was started in 1952. Pamphlets published by Catholic Action described Protestants as "libertines, women of easy virtue, traitors to their country." Cardinal Segura, of Seville, wrote pastoral letters giving repeated warnings against the alleged menace of Protestantism. Protestantism "has been tolerated to a far greater extent than is permissible," wrote the Cardinal in a pastoral letter in March, 1952. "Under the pretext of politics, concessions gravely prejudicial to religion may be made." These went so far, continued the Cardinal, that Spain, incredible to relate, was "advancing openly into the field of religious freedom." Indeed, the evil had gone so far that, again quoting the Cardinal, some people in Spain had already begun to believe "that all religions are equally acceptable in the presence of God."

In some Catholic countries—or, rather, in some countries where the Catholic Church holds undisputed sway—Catholic hatred against Protestantism can take even nastier forms.

At Fonseca Magdalena, in 1950, the Catholic bishops and the Apostolic Vicar of Caojira closed all the Protestant chapels and missions.

In 1952 the Rev. G. Riddell, Baptist missionary, opened a new chapel in the Plazuela San Martin, Bogota. At the first service a crowd massed before it and began to hurl stones at the windows. When the police were called, their response was so "sluggish" that the American Ambassador, Capus M. Waynick, a Presbyterian, had to dash there in person, staying at the service until the last Amen. On the following day there was a second attack. This time the Catholic crowd were led by Father Florencio Alvarez. The demonstrators, who were carrying banners proclaiming, "We will not be robbed of our religion," and "Colombia is Catholic," heaved stones, while Father Alvarez denounced "Protestant millionaires from the U.S.A. who try to sow disunity and uproot the true faith." The chapel had eventually to be boarded up for repairs. The U.S. Ambassador lodged a strong protest with the Colombian Government, reminding them that their Constitution of 1936

guaranteed freedom of worship. Freedom of worship, however, in Catholic Colombia, as in various other South American Catholic countries, exists only on paper. Taking Colombia as a typical Catholic country, this is proved by the following significant examples of how freedom of worship is interpreted by the Catholic Church wherever it has power.

In 1950 Colonel Nestor Mesa Prieto, chief of the Caqueta territory in South-east Colombia, banned all religious worship other than Catholic. Police were ordered to break up all non-Roman Catholic religious gatherings. The newspapers said that violators would be fined 100 pesos (about \$52) or would be jailed for fifty days.¹¹

On December 4, 1949, all Protestants at Toribio Cauca, on orders of the mayor, were rounded up, arrested, their Bibles destroyed, and they were forced to sign, under threat of death, a renunciation of their faith.¹²

In Rio Manso, on May 28, 1950, all Protestants were forced to attend Mass, under threat of death.

The Protestant Church schools and mission at La Aguado Casanare were closed by order of the Prefect, and the possessions of the missionary confiscated. In two places in the same district, two chapels were destroyed and eight other chapels were bombed or otherwise damaged.¹³

Persecution of Protestant ministers is by no means rare. A case which prompted Britain and the U.S.A. to send the most vigorous official protests to Colombia is typical, but not unique. In July, 1951, the Rev. William Courtley Easton, of the Worldwide Evangelical Crusade, was seized by the local Catholic police while he was conducting a service in his chapel in the town of Maraquita. The service was in progress when a Catholic policeman came in and struck Mr. Easton across the face with a sabre. "Another policeman then knocked him across the pulpit with a rifle butt and struck him again when he tried to rise." Easton was taken to barracks, where "he was beaten with leather straps, made to sing hymns and preach, then beaten up again. All the seized men [the Protestant congregation] were then given clubs and told to beat each other. Finally, stark naked, Easton was made to carry a huge heavy log round the inside of the barracks. There was even talk at one time of burning them alive."

Was this the work of a few fanatical Catholic zealots? By no means. Shortly before this typical example of Catholic "tolerance," a pastoral letter, issued jointly by all the Colombian bishops, incited in no uncertain language the persecution of all Protestants and other anti-Catholics. Indeed, following it, Bishop Builes of Santa Rosa issued a special pastoral letter against Protestants, asking all Catholics to co-operate in their "extermination," not only in Colombia, but throughout South America, because Protestantism "threatened the religious unity of South America."¹⁴

Protestants have occasionally been murdered. Since 1870, when Protestants were first invited to enter Mexico, over sixty Protestant missionaries have been murdered as a result of Catholic hostility. In 1930, in Peru, a Baptist missionary from Canada, on Catholic instigation, was stoned and left for dead. To consult the chronicles of Protestant missions is to come across countless cases of Catholic persecution of this kind everywhere.

Catholic odium against Protestant missionaries is not confined only to Catholic lands. It comes to the fore sometimes in the most unexpected regions, conniving even with non-Christian powers—e.g. the Japanese.

During the Second World War, following Pearl Harbour, all Americans, and, indeed, Allied individuals in Japanese or Japanese-controlled territories, were interned, Christian missionaries included—or, to be more precise, Protestant missionaries. For all Catholic missionaries—almost 7,500 of them—not only were not interned, but were given help and were even officially protected by the military and civil Japanese authorities.¹⁵

In the Philippines, the largest Catholic country in Asia, while this preferential treatment was meted out to Catholics, Protestant missionaries were duly interned; in 1944, 528 of them were still in concentration camps.

Did the Vatican intervene with the Japanese authorities to have them set free, like their Catholic colleagues? It did intervene, but to advise the puppet government of the Philippines, which consisted mostly of Catholics, "to continue in their policy of preventing certain religious spreaders of error from regaining that liberty to which they are not entitled."¹⁶

Which meant: keep the Protestants in concentration camps. This Catholic intervention was not confined to the Philippines. It was pursued, with few exceptions, wherever the invading Japanese troops set foot.

Protestants, living undisturbed in Protestant countries, are inclined to dismiss as mere exaggerated fear the warnings that Catholicism, were it given an opportunity, would not hesitate to strike at them with the bitterest intolerance. Catholic undetected undermining of Protestantism in partly Protestant, or wholly Protestant, lands is also not taken seriously. Yet facts, when seen objectively, should dispel such complacency. That the Catholic Church cannot do as she wishes is true. But that the Catholic Church is persistently undermining Protestantism everywhere she can is equally true. The Catholic Church, however, is cunning, and as a general rule her pretended conciliatory attitude, as we have already pointed out, grows in proportion to the power of the nations where Protestantism flourishes, and her enmity in proportion to the weakness of the Protestants where she is strong. Which, when reduced to the simplest terms, means that the stronger Protestantism, the more conciliatory the Vatican's attitude; the weaker, the more ruthless its intolerance.

Catholic exertions against Protestantism in countries that are not nominally Catholic can vary from a tireless campaign of penetration to the burning of Protestant literature.

In Holland, Catholic pressure against Protestantism, particularly since the Second World War, became so heavy that Protestants did not hesitate to compare it to a counter-Reformation: "What we now see is nothing else than a counter-Reformation. Rome is annexing Holland."¹⁷

Anti-Protestant odium can assume the most unexpected forms, and can spring forth simultaneously in Catholic, partially Catholic, and Protestant countries. E.g. it can be directed against what, according to the Catholic Church, is a typical Protestant institution: Father Christmas.

Father Christmas is of a purely Protestant and pagan origin, Catholics in many countries were told. "Drop the Father Christmas myth, and make Christmas Catholic." Following this directive to Catholicize Christmas, Catholic organizations, papers, and hierarchies began the promotion of a campaign

directed at "removing" the symbol of Protestantism, Father Christmas, and replacing it by the symbol of Catholicism, the crib.

The movement was conducted with increasing activity, not only in Catholic lands, but also in Scotland, England, Holland, the U.S.A., and other Protestant countries. In England, from 1950 onwards, great posters placarded the walls of London and other towns, depicting the crib. The Christmas before (1949) everyone taking a ride in one of Milwaukee's 280 taxis (U.S.A.) found himself looking at a picture of the Holy Family; Father Christmas having simultaneously been "replaced" in 1,200 trams and buses by the Catholic Holy Family. In the following years the campaign spread to other American towns. In spite of its obvious anti-Protestant and essentially Catholic inspiration, the curious spectacle was soon seen of Protestants joining hands with Catholics in this odd war against poor Father Christmas. Many justified their co-operation by declaring that what they did was simply to help put Christ back into Christmas. This was the Catholic slogan and the Catholic ruse, conveniently used where Catholics were in a minority. In countries where Catholics were in a majority, the question of replacing Father Christmas so as to put back Christ became a case of liquidating him as an anti-Catholic symbol.

Christmas of 1951 saw an ominous example of the sinister meaning of this seemingly quixotic and banal crusade. In December of that year, Cardinal Saliege, of Toulouse, came out with the somewhat butchery slogan, "Kill Father Christmas." Thousands of French children, who, since the falling of the first autumn leaves, had been making secret plans about the size of their stockings, in thrilling anticipation of the coming of the reindeers and their rubicund driver, were shocked. What had Père Noël done? Had the American Federal Bureau of Investigation informed its new county, France, that he was a Bolshevik? For certain truly democratic-minded Americans, like Hoover, Chief of the F.B.I., or Senator McCarthy, there was crushing evidence that Father Christmas was an old "Bolshie" (although not all children thought so). His coat was red—scarlet at that. His cheeks were also red. The tip of his nose was altogether cherry-red.

But then, asked some potential little French "fellow-

travellers," why did the Cardinal not ask us to "liquidate" Père Noël on previous Christmases? Had the Cardinal also—like almost all the seventeen French governments which had followed one another in the last six years (1945-51)—got a dollar loan?

Some Catholic parents, although obviously taken aback by such unseemly political precocity, hushed them up. They should not be soft-hearted, they told them. They had to listen to the voice of Mother Church. Besides, they should not worry. After Père Noël had been butchered, the Three Kings would arrive instead, to fill their stockings. And yes, by the way, the Three Kings would fill the stockings of only those good children who helped in killing Père Noël.

It was thus that, two days before Christmas, two thousand children banded together. Thereupon, having solemnly condemned Father Christmas to death, they paraded through the streets of Dijon and halted before the cathedral. Then, having hung an eight-foot, straw-filled effigy of Père Noël on the cathedral fence, they set about to liquidate him.

Mother Church, however, is a compassionate mother. Now, as always in the past, she was loath to spill blood. . . . So, as a further example of her charitable tolerance for all Protestants, she resorted to her old, honoured device, thanks to which she once disposed of so many of them without spilling a single drop of Christian blood . . . and bade the little French children roast Père Noël by means of a good, red, glowing *auto-da-fé*.¹⁸

And so it truly came to pass that poor Père Noël, who had never dabbled with Catholic theology, was burnt, to the hurrahs of thousands of youthful voices and the hidden tears of a few shy little dreamers, staring with a broken heart at the smoking embers which once had been their long anxiously awaited friend.

M. Feltin, the Archbishop of Paris, approved: "The Christian significance of Christmas is debased by this legend," he said, "originating in the dense Saxon forests."

Thousands of other children, however, who did not care a fig, either for the voices of cardinals or for the political ties of sundry American loans (and this, as the American F.B.I. later disclosed, was because they had been inspired by Moscow), a

few hours later defied both. Having assembled before the Town Hall, with the crudest disregard for the susceptibilities of Catholic theology—or, as one bespectacled little Atheist sneeringly piped, “Catholic mythology”—not to mention the delicate nerves of several Committees of Un-American and Un-French activities, staged a triumphant resurrection of the so-recently deceased Père Noël, paraded him through the square, and gave him a lusty welcome into the land of the living.

Grown-ups throughout France soon joined in the fray, and their newspapers came out either for or against further burnings and further resurrections of Father Christmas.¹⁹ Some even devoted their leaders to the defence of Santa Claus, comparing his burning with the burning of the vanities by Savonarola, the burning of heretics, and the bonfires of the Hitler-jugend.²⁰

To dismiss this pied-piper-like incident as insignificant is to miss its hidden meaning. The Catholic burning of Father Christmas was more than a symbol of the potentialities of hatred of the Catholic Church. It was concrete evidence that the fires of the Inquisition are not dead. Indeed, that, should the opportunity arise, they would be used to burn Protestants and their works as unhesitatingly as in the past.

This is not speculation. An even more ominous example occurred in Canada, also in 1951, and should make Protestants who are concerned with the future ponder. We quote from the *Montreal Herald*:

Rev. Alfred Roy, a Roman Catholic priest, *has admitted burning religious pamphlets mailed to Baptists*. The statement was made by postal inspector W. L. Gagne, sent to this North-Western Quebec community (Rouyn) to investigate charges made by the Baptist pastor, L. G. Barnhart, of nearby Noranda. Barnhart charged that religious pamphlets addressed to Baptists in Ste. Germaine Boule . . . failed to reach their destination. Gagne said the postmaster . . . Wilfred Begin, had admitted holding up delivery of the pamphlets on orders from Father Roy. Begin has been relieved of his office. . . . Inspector Gagne said Father Roy had told him he burned the mail because the letters, consisting of mimeographed sermons by Pastor Barnhart . . . “would give people wrong ideas.”²¹

The flames which burned Baptist pamphlets could be made to burn something far dearer not only to all Baptists

but to all Protestants and, indeed, to all Christians—i.e. Bibles.

Mere supposition? Facts prove otherwise.

On May 27, 1923, Protestant Bibles were burned in Rome, "in honour of the Virgin"²²; nine years later, in 1932, during Ireland's Eucharistic Congress in Dublin, Protestant Gospels were publicly burned; almost a decade later, in 1940, Franco had more than 100,000 Protestant Bibles destroyed and ground to pulp or burned.²³ On December 4, 1949, all Protestant Bibles were burned by order of the Mayor of Toribio Cauca, Colombia. In May, 1950, the Bibles of the Protestant chapels in the district of La Aguado Casanare, again in Colombia, were ceremoniously burned.

Did Catholic fire vent itself only against Protestant literature or the Bible? By no means. Catholic flames burned down Protestant chapels with equally pious hatred, as happened in the province of La Aguado Casanare, where by 1950 twenty-four Protestant chapels had been wantonly burned down by Catholics.²⁴ Or in Spain, where in 1952 gangs of Catholic Action, following the direct official anti-Protestant directives of the Spanish hierarchy—e.g. the pastoral letters of Cardinal Segura of Seville, published March, 1952—after having burst into the Protestant chapel of St. Basil, in Seville, and after having beaten Pastor Santos Martin Molin, poured petrol on the altar and tried to set the church on fire, while in the following month (April), at Badajoz, twenty-one students of the Marist Brothers' schools, after having ransacked the Evangelical Chapel, which the Government had kept closed since 1949, burned all the hymn-books and other literature on a bonfire outside.

Deadly Catholic flames can be made to scorch Protestant flesh. In 1909, at Dores do Turvo, in Brazil, a local Catholic priest called on the populace, who had mobbed a Protestant clergyman, *to burn him alive*.

Nineteen hundred and nine is a long time back. Catholic longing to burn Protestants alive, however, has remained as potent and vigorous as ever. In 1952 in Seville, those same Catholics who tried to set a Protestant church on fire, as mentioned above, attempted at the same time to burn its Protestant pastor, or, quoting the words spoken in the British House of Commons: "An attempt was made to burn the clergyman

himself—to the shouts of ‘the Protestants are finished.’”²⁴ Catholic priests have not only urged the faithful to burn non-Catholics, they have burned whole families of heretics, slaughtered whole villages; and literally thousands of men, women, and children have been actually massacred by Catholics and even by Catholic priests and Catholic monks. These horrors were organized by the Catholic Church at a period when she thought she had acquired absolute spiritual and political power in the country where they were perpetrated. It was undoubtedly the most significant burst of Catholic hatred against non-Catholic Christianity ever to occur during the last one hundred years.

The significance of such bloody Catholic ruthlessness is of such tremendous proportions because such burning and massacres occurred in the very midst of this our twentieth century—not in some uncharted region of Asia or Africa, but in civilized Christian Europe, and precisely in Yugoslavia during World War II.

In the ordinary way, whenever the Catholic Church can exert even partial influence, her anti-Protestant odium can flare up more frequently than is generally realized, and in the most unlikely places.

In Canada, about forty-two per cent of the population are Catholics. Catholics, therefore, are still in a minority and, consequently, persecution by them is not possible. Even so, Catholics do not hesitate to show their cloven hooves, not only by burning Protestant literature, but also by other no less significant deeds. Some of these, no matter how superficially isolated, portend, more than anything else, what lies in store for Canadian democracy should Canada become Catholic. Here is a typical case:

For years, Catholic Canadians pressed their government to disassociate the Canadian National Anthem with the English. The reason? Its source was Protestant in content and spirit. Decades went by and nothing happened. No sooner, however, than Canada had a Catholic Prime Minister, Catholic demands were satisfied and Premier St. Laurent acceded to them. This was not all; in 1952 the devout Catholic St. Laurent proposed to displace the word “Dominion,” as a policy designed “to shake off the British Protestant connections.”

In those parts of Canada where Catholics are in the majority, Protestants can be openly persecuted, under the flimsiest of pretexts. E.g. in November, 1950, thirty-one Baptists were arrested and sent to jail in Val d'Or, Quebec. The charge: obstruction of the traffic while holding a street service.²⁵

Such anti-democratic, anti-Protestant, proceedings can occur anywhere, their inspiration being always the same. In Londonderry, 200 Catholic workers went on strike as a protest against the marriage of a Catholic assistant forewoman to a Protestant.²⁶

Cases of Catholic intolerance have occurred and still occur both in England and in the U.S.A. E.g. Catholic indignation in 1930 because the British Governor of Malta had opened his palace to three Anglican bishops.²⁷ Or the Catholic mob, led by the local head of the American Legion and two Catholic priests, interrupting a meeting of Jehovah's Witnesses, Rochester, New Hampshire, on June 27, 1951.

In the U.S.A., the Catholic Church, although at odds with the Protestant Churches, dares to talk of democracy, of freedom, even of religious liberty; and, indeed, goes so far as superficially to advocate the separation of Church and State. More than this, she has attempted, not unsuccessfully, to enlist the support of a considerable section of American Protestantism in her political crusades. Here the Vatican is conducting its fight screened behind the specious words of tolerance in which it has never believed, becoming, chameleon-like, almost "protestant" in its liberal attitude towards a society not conforming to its religious and political tenets. The reasons for this, as already indicated, are obvious: the U.S.A. is the mightiest country in the Western world, has become the Vatican's most important lay partner, is the dominant financial power in the Vatican's administration, and, last but not least, has become the major target which the Catholic Church has set out to capture from within. Hence, here Catholic antagonism is reduced to the bare minimum. But Catholic activities, which are ultimately still directed against Protestantism, are at their maximum. These aim at strengthening Catholic power everywhere, via Catholic penetration, Catholic political alliances with certain sections of Protestantism, and, above all, by a slow but steady Catholic undermining of Protestant-inspired institutions—e.g.

the American Constitution, which the American Catholic hierarchy, in an official statement in 1948, had the audacity to select as the target of their attack, so as to pull down "the metaphor of the wall of separation of Church and State."²⁸

The same tactics were used in Canada, when the Catholic Premier, St. Laurent, went into power. During his stay in office, two significant moves were made in that direction: the amendment of the Canadian Constitution (September, 1950), especially in the field of jurisdiction, and the proposed appointment of a Canadian ambassador to the Vatican.

The proposed amendment of the Canadian Constitution was particularly significant for American Protestants in so far as for decades past Canadian Catholics had claimed that Canon Law should take precedence over Civil Law—namely, that Catholic principles, particularly in the matter of moral issues, legalization of marriage, sex education, contraception, and the like, should replace a Constitution based upon Protestant tenets.

The Catholic Church in the U.S.A. aims at precisely the same goal. Some of her exponents have already openly said so: "The old Protestant culture is about at the end of its rope," declared Father F. X. Talbot, former editor of the Jesuit magazine, *America*, "Why can't we raise a tidal wave that will bring Catholic culture into the U.S.? Why can't we make the U.S. Catholic in legislation, Catholic in justice, aims, and ideals?"²⁹

These are the true, ultimate, and never-forgotten aims of the Catholic Church in the U.S.A., in Canada, in England, and, in fact, wherever there are Protestants.

Catholic tolerance of Protestantism in Catholic and non-Catholic countries, therefore, is but a tactical move forcibly imposed upon her by the modern world, but also voluntarily accepted as a means to achieve a goal no matter how distant: the weakening and final destruction of Protestantism.

This is not speculation. The few instances of boycott and violence just cited are ominous warnings of things to come, were Catholicism to gain the upper hand. That most of the cases just quoted are exceptional, no one will deny. Yet that their implication is that, were the Vatican to have sufficient power, open, violent and unrestricted persecutions would become a matter of course, cannot be lightly dismissed as mere

fantasy. Today, Catholicism lacks power, even in wholly Catholic countries. Hence its tactics of superficial toleration. Toleration, however, is unwillingly adopted, "for the sake of avoiding some greater evil, or of obtaining or preserving some greater good," as Pope Leo XIII explained.³⁰ The "greater good" now is that of avoiding any open antagonism with Protestant nations, owing to the latter's political and military powers, or hindering Catholic penetration in the Protestant world.

This, it must never be forgotten, is only a temporary expedient. The Catholic Church is tolerating Protestantism, because the necessity of the moment has forced her even to befriend it. Catholic odium and will to destroy it, although hidden, are as potent as ever. Catholic Canon Laws still declare, as forcefully as in the Middle Ages, that all Protestants are heretics, that all their denominations are false, spurious, and execrable; that all Protestants are doomed to hell in the next world, and that they are still subject to all the spiritual and even temporal penalties of the Catholic Church in this. The Catholic Church must tolerate such spreaders of error because, as Leo XIII further said, "she judges it expedient that they should be permitted." But, he added, "she would in happier times resume her own liberty."³⁰

Notwithstanding this, the Catholic Church still continues to wage a tireless war against them. It is a war that is hardly noticed, for it is conducted with the greatest discretion, but it is not less real because it is camouflaged.

Catholics everywhere, for instance, are strictly forbidden to read Protestant Bibles and books; sing in Protestant churches, attend Protestant services, enrol their children in Protestant schools, be married by Protestant ministers. No Catholic can marry a Protestant without permission from his Church. A Protestant mother with a Catholic husband must bring up her children as Catholics. This is the *sine qua non* of her husband's obtaining permission to marry her. Should either partner refuse to sign such a pledge, the Catholic will not be allowed into matrimony. Catholics are further warned about mixing with Protestants, or joining clubs or associations which treat all religions alike. The Holy Office decree of 1950, forbidding priests to belong to the Rotary Clubs, being a case

in point. Catholic Canon Law explicitly prohibits joint worship; and Catholics are forbidden to join international congresses or councils directed at the promotion of the unity of Christendom—for instance, the assemblies of the World Council of Churches, and similar bodies.

This ostracism of Protestantism, although not of a spectacular kind, in the long run is far more effective than the many cases of persecution and boycott already quoted, interfering as it does with the daily life of thousands of Catholic and non-Catholic individuals, as well as with local, national, and international organizations. Such interference, directed at maintaining and widening religious, social, and ideological differences, can very often reverberate, either separately or simultaneously, in the social, economic, and political fields and on a domestic and even international scale.

But where Catholicism is waging an even slyer and therefore very dangerous anti-Protestant struggle is in the political arena. This, to be sure, is not pursued by the launching of any direct, obvious, or even veiled attack against Protestantism, either from political platforms or by "briefing" political leaders or parties. That would bring obvious peril. It is conducted with the most oblique tactics, and with such subtle cunning that it is undetected by large sections of the Protestants themselves. The strategy of the Catholic Church here is to attack Protestantism's staunchest ally, whose destruction would inevitably spell Protestant doom—namely, Democracy.

The maintenance of the democratic framework of society is the greatest guarantee of Protestant survival *vis-à-vis* Catholic machinations. As long as democratic principles hold sway, democratic tolerance will make it possible for the various Protestant denominations to live unhampered, with a minimum of restrictions or, indeed, with no restrictions at all.

Should, however, these liberties be made to vanish by Catholic pressure, Protestant exertions would be restricted or made to vanish with them. Which means that, political tolerance having gone, religious tolerance would disappear as surely as Catholic intolerance, in the shape of political and religious authoritarianism, would be the inevitable result.

It is the power of world opinion, the pressure of global

political influences, the fear of imperilling precious alliances, but, above all, democracy in action, whether on a national or an international scale, which so far have prevented the Vatican from unloosing anti-Protestant persecutions wherever it is dominant. This must never be forgotten.

To prevent the disappearance of freedom, and hence of religious tolerance and the peaceful existence and development of Protestantism, therefore, the paramount duty of all Protestants is to impede the Vatican from infiltrating, as it is so successfully doing at present, into the political life of nations.

For political control, as we have already learned, ultimately means religious control, and vice versa, the two being indivisible.

The Vatican's global fight against democracy, when examined in this light, thus becomes the Vatican's global fight against all non-Catholic religion and denominations, beginning with Protestantism.

Were such a fight to be lost, consequently, Protestantism would not only suffer; it would be hunted down and scourged out of existence by a Church implacably determined to exterminate all her opponents, without compassion and without mercy.

CATHOLIC IMPERIALISM AGAINST THE ASIATIC CONTINENT

THE CAUSES OF POLITICAL COM-motions, like meteorological ones, can be not only detected, but scrutinized and classified. Among the numberless factors which during the last decades have provoked the sullen awakening of Asia, the religious ones loom prominently in the tenebrous landscape of Western-Eastern history.

That the chief begetters of Asiatic rebellion are the main applications of science, the promoters, if not the sires, of a global ideology sponsoring world revolution, is probably correct. Besides these, resentment against the ideological and religious claims of the West being a paramount factor in the rift which has separated the Asiatic and the Western worlds is not only correct but a certainty.

Today Asia is on her feet. She is on the move. She is parting company with the West. Indeed, she is marching against the West. This is not simply a reaction against foreign political imperialism or exploitation by economic encroachment; it is something deeper; it is the spiritual revolt of the Asian mind against the alien Western one. The longing for economic redress is a mighty lever. The longing for racial equality can prove even mightier. A spiritual rebellion

animated by the two is wellnigh irresistible. The Asian rebellion, besides being directed against Western wares, is also directed against Western ideas. For the articles of export of the West were not only such items as "movies," chewing-gum, and printed fabrics, but also religion—i.e. Christianity.

But if the value of goods is best judged by the demand for them, the universality of lofty principles is gauged not by abstractions but by the concrete deeds of their heralds. How do Christian doctrines and practice emerge when examined with the critical eyes of non-Christian races? The judgment is unflattering and, although biased, correct. Christianity never meant or practised what it preached; particularly when dealing with non-Christian peoples. Christian missions were never solely Christian missions. They were invariably preceded, accompanied, or followed by Western warehouses, Western diplomacy, and Western armies. Whichever the sequence, the result was eternally the same: the partial or total loss of the regional, national, and racial liberty of the Asiatics, wherever and whenever the Cross and the Western Hat had made their appearance. The voluntary or forced acceptance of both was proclaimed to be the victory of Christian civilization, and Christian civilization came to mean whatever tended to be dominant—in other words, whatever was Western—success very often depending on the appearance of naval squadrons off the coasts.

The inseparability of the trader and the missionary soon yielded ample dividends—namely, the transformation of practically the whole globe into a colony of the West. Backward and highly civilized peoples lost their independence; their cultures were ridiculed, the colour of their skin became a mark of opprobrium; their past, present, and even potential future achievements were scorned and despised—why, their very claim to partake of human nature and thus to have an affinity with the white race was often resented. This while, at the same time, Western religion preached universal brotherhood, Western democracy the rights of all men, and Western idealism the equality of all races.

In most of the dwellers in Asiatic towns, even of the 4,000,000 in Asiatic villages, a peculiar conviction grew: that Christianity was synonymous with the West and the West

with Christianity, and that their dissociation was an impossibility. This became a belief not only of the Chinese coolies and the Indian peasants, but also of the Western nations themselves. To them all, Christianity was the religion of the West. It was an intrinsic part of the West. It was the West. This was true; as religion, whenever striking roots within a given civilization, soon partakes of the nature of the races forming it. In fact, since its transplantation from Judea, Christianity had become Western, and since then had become the dominant world religion, not through the strength of its principles but through the physical dominance of the White race. In spite of, or possibly because of, this Christianity is still spurned by most of Asia as being hopelessly identified with the rapacity of the Western world, of Western Imperialism and of Western "White supremacy."

To think, however, that Asia has rejected Christianity simply because it is a by-product of the West would be erroneous. Science and industrialism are Western by-products; yet they are welcomed. Marxism is a by-product of Western thought, yet a few decades have sufficed to plant its seeds throughout a continent in which almost two thousand years of Christian efforts were spent with the most dismal result. In the light of this, Asia's contemporary rejection of Christianity and acceptance of a revolutionary ideology is of portentous significance. In this sense: that, whereas the former is spurned not only because of its Westernization but, indeed, also because of its eschatological message, the latter is embraced on account of its promises of concrete redress, not in any problematical future existence but in the present one, here and now.

Whether Communism, as the inspirer of a world revolution, is beneficial or harmful is anyone's opinion. Its phenomenal spreading, however, is a fact. Its girdling of the globe has caused incalculable repercussions. It has contributed to a swifter awakening of Asia, to a quicker emergence of Asian nationalism, to a fiercer Asian opposition to Christianity. Such a rejection of Christianity is not only of tremendous importance for Asia; it has a universal meaning. For it signifies a rejection of the basic message of religion and, therefore, the rejection of all religions. This rejection in its turn has provoked

social and political turmoils which have reverberated throughout the world and are an integral part of the calamitous restlessness of our century.

Could the mere preaching of an unadulterated Christianity or of the basic principle of the brotherhood of man have provoked such far-reaching Asiatic reaction? If not, what was, and, indeed what is, its fundamental cause? The reply is: Political Christianity.

Political Christianity has poisoned, at the very source, Asiatic-Western relations. Since its inception in the Far East, Christianity, having appeared in the apparel of religion, has always emerged as a political force at the service of Western individuals and nations. Protestantism is as guilty as Catholicism. Like the Catholic, so also the Protestant missionaries were invariably preceded or followed by traders, gun-boats, or military expeditions. Political Protestantism, however, although guilty, cannot be put on a par with Catholicism. The damage caused by political Catholicism in Asia has been incommensurably greater than anything done by all the other Christian Churches put together.

This has been due to sundry factors. Catholicism came into the field before Protestantism was born. Unlike those of Protestantism, all its missionaries' activities were fully co-ordinated and had specific religious-political goals. By purposely employing political power to subdue Asiatic people in the religious field, Catholicism poisoned Asiatic-Western relations from the very beginning, and this poisoning has contributed, perhaps more than anything else, to the inborn suspicions of the Asiatic people towards the West, which has reverberated in all fields to our present day.

The political claims of the Catholic Church upon non-Christian lands are inseparable from her religious ones. This owing to the fact that, whenever sending out her missionaries, her aim is to make the newly converted people simultaneously members of the Church and subjects of the Pope. The two are inseparable. As in the West, so also in the East, wherever there is the Catholic Church there also is the Vatican; that is to say, Catholic diplomatic and political interests.

Catholic missionaries, therefore, are automatically transformed into *political agents* and ultimately become the founda-

tion stones of the political power of the Catholic Church wherever they erect Catholic communities. As no Catholic individual or mission can remain outside the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope, which, as we have already seen, becomes in the last resort *political subjugation*, Vatican diplomacy, regardless of any historical habitat, has always acted upon the principle of capturing political power via religious penetration. Whether in the past or in the present, in Europe or in Asia, this is usually done by the skilful employment of secular instruments whose interests run parallel with its own.

Thus, while recently the Vatican associated itself with a Turkish dictator to thwart a rival Church, or struck a tacit alliance with a mighty Protestant nation like the U.S.A. to fight Communism, in centuries gone by it co-operated with commercial enterprises in the establishment of new trade-routes, or participated in schemes of territorial conquest executed by Catholic countries with a view to subjugating other, non-Christian, lands or races. Then, as now, this had two final objectives: the ultimate domination by the Catholic Church of both the subjugators and the subjugated.

Such Catholic religious-political activities have often produced far-reaching effects, of a most nefarious nature, upon the history of mankind. They became the direct cause of political and military disasters in Western dealings with Asia; disasters popularly believed to be due merely to the blunders, rapacity, and short-sightedness of imperialistic nations, and never to the religious intransigence of the Catholic Church, to the diplomatic duplicity of the Vatican, or to the thirst for domination of both which, very often, by befouling the current of history, have contributed to the perennial detriment of the peaceful relationship of the peoples of the world.

To prove that such an assertion is neither an exaggeration nor a distortion of facts, a glance at one or two typical examples of the nature and methods of Catholic approaches to Asia should suffice.

.

The first intercourse with China and Mongolia, at the beginning of the second millennium of the Christian era, was of a most brazen political character. The Popes, in virtue of

their claims to world rulership, sent messages to what was then the practically unknown Far East, asking point-blank for the submission of the Mongolian or Chinese rulers to Rome. This incredible audacity was not caused by the megalomania of a single individual; it was the coolly calculated plan of Vatican diplomacy, bent then, as it is now, on the Catholic political domination of the world.

One of the first of these acts was that taken by Pope Innocent IV in 1245. In this year he dispatched an embassy of Dominican monks, led by Nicholas Anselm of Lombardy. Their mission: to bring Christianity to the ruler of the Mongols, to sign a pact of allegiance with him, and, last but not least, to make him publicly acknowledge the lordship of the Pope.

Nicholas Anselm, after a long voyage, in August, 1247, met a leader of the Mongolian Army who, having received his message, sent him back accompanied by two Tartar Mongolian envoys. These carried to Rome a deliberately discourteous counter-message. As the Pope had sent his envoys to make the rulers of Central Asia his vassals, was their discourse, so now the Mongolian ruler did the same: he sent his own envoys to the Pope to ask him to become the vassal of the Great Khan . . . for the Great Khan also was the ruler of the world.

Simultaneously with the first mission, however, Innocent IV had dispatched a second, composed of two Franciscans, Friar John and Lorenzo of Portugal, as Papal Legate, with full legal powers to make the Lord of Tartary a vassal of the Roman See.

Friar John left his cloister on April 16, 1245, and set out to find the Mongol Empire, by way of Bohemia, where he was joined by a companion, Brother Stephen. He travelled into Russia and, having annexed Brother Benedict in Poland, made his way eastward. By Easter, 1246, they had crossed the Volga, and "most tearfully we set out, not knowing whether for life or for death." In July of the same year they entered Mongolia and arrived in time to witness the enthronement of the new Khan. There, to their astonishment, they found Russian and Hungarian priests and various court officials who were Christians, but not of the "true Church"—that is to say, who were not Catholic.

The mission ended in failure, the Great Khan having

received somewhat disrespectfully the demand for political subservience of the religious ruler of Rome, with roars of unreligious laughter. The Popes, however, besides being serious, were persistent individuals. The laugh of the Great Khan, after having made them sulk for a while, also caused them to change tactics. Their claims this time were sent via a Catholic Western ruler, the King of France, Louis IX, who, in 1249, acting as a vassal of the Pope, sent to the Mongol ruler an embassy consisting of Dominicans under Andrew of Longumeau. Its object was to present the Great Khan with relics of saints and to obtain his formal submission to Papal authority. When the Dominicans arrived at his Court, the miraculous effects of the oncoming relics had already done their wondrous work, by remote control—the Great Khan was dead.

Catholic kings, like Popes, are also made of stubborn stuff, and so, in May, 1253, Louis sent out another mission. The traveller this time was a Franciscan friar, William de Rubruquis, who departed carrying letters to the new Khan. In them Louis asked the Khan to embrace Christianity and to acknowledge the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. After a long journey Friar William arrived at the Court of the Great Khan at Karakorum on the day after Christmas and appeared before him, chanting in Latin the hymn of the Nativity.¹ The Great Khan, after having listened to William's exhortation to submit to Papal authority, asked numerous questions about France, the West, and Christianity, "for the Pope's claims had demonstrated the feasibility of putting forward similar claims" of his own on France, Christian Europe, and the West. Indeed, he added, to the incredulous indignation of the Friar, that he was seriously considering conquering Rome and making "the Vicar of Christ" his own vassal.

Notwithstanding all these setbacks, however, the Popes continued their efforts and soon afterwards charged the two daring Polo brothers, Venetian merchants, with a special embassy for the Great Khan. They had previously journeyed in China and were about to return there.

These two brothers, now Papal messengers, set out in 1271, accompanied not only by the famous Marco Polo but also by two preaching friars, and having arrived at the court of Kublai Khan in 1275, after "a tremendous journey of one thousand

days," delivered the Papal message to the ruler of the Mongol Empire.

In 1278, Pope Nicholas III sent five monks to Kublai Khan. They vanished in the Asiatic hinterland, and no news was ever received of their ultimate fate.

The Popes again persevered, and a decade later they dispatched another mission, led by the Franciscan monk, John of Montecorvino, who, having left Europe in 1289, reached South China in 1292, finally arriving in Peking, the capital, whence in 1305 he sent a favourable report, followed by another in 1306. He had found Christians there, he said. Many he had converted. The country enjoyed complete religious toleration. No opposition was offered to Christian preaching, and those who embraced the true faith submitted to Papal authority with humility.

At such heartening news the Pope took an ominous step: the creation of the hierarchy. In the following year, 1307, he nominated Montecorvino Archbishop of Peking. The first foundation stone upon which to erect Papal dominion in distant Cathay had been successfully laid in the very capital of the Celestial Empire. Great plans were made and, soon afterwards, numerous bishops, priests, monks, and others were dispatched to Peking. Although many were never heard of again, most of them reached the Chinese capital in safety. The Christians began to multiply and a promising Catholic Church began to grow within China. After Peking, other great towns such as Zaitun and Yangchou, in addition to numerous parishes and churches, were given their bishops or minor hierarchs. Result: when in 1328 John of Montecorvino died, the small Catholic seed seemed to be about to grow into a mighty tree.

This unexpected and astounding result spurred the Popes to renewed efforts and Papal envoys followed missionaries wherever these went, to extend Papal spiritual jurisdiction, penetrating the most inaccessible lands of mysterious Asia—e.g. Odoric of Pordenone who, having travelled along the coast of China between 1320 and 1330 as well as daring the Tibetan route, compiled an exhaustive report of religious conditions prevailing in those regions.

The religious conquest of the Chinese, however, in the eyes

of the Vatican was not enough. It had to be completed by the political one—that is to say, the inescapable rule that a Catholic cannot but be the subject of the Pope, owing allegiance to him first and to the State afterwards. This had to be applied to the distant Catholic community of China, as it had been to Europe in the Middle Ages and still is applied, even if in a diluted form, to our very day.

Having created the religious machinery through which, eventually, their political power would have been exercised—namely, a regular, obedient Chinese hierarchy centred in Peking—the Popes took the inevitable step of assuring their political domination and sent to China their highest representative—a Papal Legate—having full spiritual and political powers second only to their own.

Papal Imperialism was growing with the utmost rapidity in the immense Chinese Empire. Then the horizon unexpectedly darkened. Communications between Peking and Rome diminished and became ever more difficult until, finally, they ceased altogether. The last were those sent by John Marignoli, Papal Legate in Peking from 1342 to 1346. After which the great Empires of Cathay and of the Great Khans were cut off from the West as thoroughly as though they had been swallowed up by the earth. The Popes grew increasingly anxious about the fate of their subjects in far-away Tartary, so much so, that, in 1370, Urban V, having decided to resume the link, sent a Papal Legate, an archbishop, and eighty priests to Peking. Their task was to relink the Church in China with Rome. The Papal Legate and his retinue departed; no news was ever received of any one of them.

Not long afterwards, however, rumours of political cataclysms in the depths of Asia reached the West. Moslem invasions, military commotions, and the cavalries of Tamerlane thundering across the Asiatic continent had made the Mongolian dynasty tumble to the ground, and the flourishing Church of China, unable to withstand the tornado, was buried under its own ruins.

Although neither Mongolia, nor China, nor, indeed, any other Asiatic country ever embraced Christianity or, even less,

acknowledged the supremacy of the Popes, the latter had, nevertheless, by sheer tenacity and an unbounded faith in their unique office, succeeded within a century in opening an immense field of missionary activity throughout tremendous tracts of land stretching from the Dnieper to Tibet, from Persia to Peking.

That such remarkable results were ultimately to end in total failure does not diminish their importance and, above all, the profound significance of the Papal exertions. Indeed, the far-flung implications of such attempts, when viewed in conjunction with the ages in which they were made, enhance the nature and the immense scope of the religious and political ambitions of the Popes, even when remembering that such efforts were motivated by an unbounded lust for political power.

For it must not be forgotten that the Western world of the Middle Ages was in reality a very narrow world, and that therefore the Papal endeavours to bring under the tiara lands and nations beyond the Western boundaries formed an enterprise which no other institution could dream of undertaking, even less undertake.

The Pope's ambitions prompted the discovery of the interior of Asia, produced an immense addition to the sphere of geography, opened almost illimitable vistas to Western minds, and broadened the very physical aspect of the world, to an extent practically inconceivable to modern man.

When it is remembered that Papal envoys like Friar John, Carpini, William de Rubruquis, travellers like the Venetian Polos, and the various Papal Legates, notwithstanding the abysmal mental and physical narrowness of the Middle Ages, either went by land from the shores of the Mediterranean to Peking, and, indeed, to Japan itself, or circumnavigated Asia from Basra to Canton, then it should not be difficult to realize that at this period (about 1300) there took place a discovery of the Asiatic continent as exciting, tremendous, and probably no less important than the discovery of the Americas two centuries later.

Yet, after due credit is given to the Popes for opening the Asiatic world, their responsibility for adulterating the relationship between East and West from the very beginning cannot pass without mention.

Indeed, it is doubtful, when carefully weighed, whether their opening up of Asia was not to the disadvantage of both the Yellow and the White races. For by poisoning the first Western-Asiatic contacts at their very source they contaminated the whole Western-Asiatic outlook up to the present day.

The tremendous damage done by the Vatican in this direction is not in its sending out of Catholic missionaries to spread Christianity, but in its use of them as the agents of a political Power seeking political domination of the unknown territories of Asia—that is to say, it used them as the vanguard of political Imperialism, resting upon and indissolubly bound to organized religion; in other words, the Catholic Church.

It should be noted that the first embassies of the Popes to China were not religious but political. The Christian envoys were first received by the Chinese rulers not as Christian missionaries but as the political representatives of a political Power—namely, the Vatican. Consequently, Christianity began to be interpreted as political Imperialism and was identified with a Western religious system which could not be divorced from the political attempts at expansion by Western rulers represented, at first, by the Popes, then by the Catholic Kings of Spain and Portugal, and, subsequently, by other Western Powers.

This identification with Christianity of Western political Imperialism implanted by the Popes in the thirteenth century has never been substantially denied in either theory or practice. From then until recently Asiatic-Western history is, with very rare exceptions, but a most sordid story of Western-Christian greed, rapacity, and injustice. The result was an intense suspicion, bitterness, and resentment against anything Western, beginning with Christianity, which quickly came to mean the religious softening of the Asiatic people in preparation for political or military Western penetration.

Reaction to this has been written in blood ever since. For the Popes never ceased to send their emissaries with a view to extending their dominion. After the cavalries of Tamerlane had gone and a new dynasty had sat upon the throne of the Celestial Empire of China, new envoys, missionaries, embassies, and Papal Legates were dispatched into Asia from the Vatican in a never-ending stream. They did not stop only in Mon-

golia or China; they went into new regions such as Indo-China, Siam, Burma, the Malay peninsula, Manchuria, Korea, and even unknown Japan. Wherever they went, churches, hospitals, and schools were erected; Christian communities came into being, and the message of the Christian gospel was received with humble acceptance, supercilious indifference, and tacit or open hostility.

Wherever a representative of the Catholic Church arrived, however, politics became sooner or later inextricably mixed with religion. The Vatican, always alert to the use of political influence to further its religious interests, took, therefore, every possible opportunity of using it. The result was that whereas at times religion benefited, more often religion became the main sufferer; and worse still, the poison implanted in the minds of the Asiatic people sank deeper. To pursue its designs the Vatican never hesitated to strike the most unlikely alliances, now with local potentates, with Western nations, with trading companies, or, indeed, with whoever it could use to this end. Such means resulted in Asiatic political set-backs, a wholly justified Asiatic reaction which the Christians immediately labelled religious persecution, Asiatic intolerance, and hatred.

Instances of political machinations on the part of the Vatican occurred in practically every land of Asia during the last five hundred years, and in view of the disastrous effects which certain of them produced, it might be useful to glance at one or two typical examples with a bearing on modern problems.

One of the most outstanding is that connected with France's first bid for Asiatic dominions when, early in the seventeenth century, the French East India Company was originally formed. The Company's goal, in addition to the advancement of commerce in the East, was to colonize the backward regions of the Orient with the ultimate aim of bringing them into the French orbit.

Seemingly remote, though no less concrete an aim, was the propagation of the Catholic faith. This last objective, although apparently prompted mainly by individual Catholics, was directly inspired by the Vatican, which backed the French East India Company from the very start.

However, having established its first outposts in India, the Company soon encountered resistance of a strength which could not be foreseen, represented chiefly by the British, who resisted the French holdings at every step, until the French decided to look to other fields.

It was thus that in the following century France, having become convinced of the futility of continuing her competition with Britain, finally decided to turn her attention to the small kingdoms of Indo-China and, in particular, to Siam. The first exploration of the new regions on behalf of the French East India Company was undertaken not, it should be noted, by any official of the Company or by any diplomat of the French kingdom, but by Catholic missionaries. This was done with the permission and encouragement of the Vatican, which, under the pretence of religion, sent them to investigate the commercial, political, and strategic resources of the countries in question, on behalf of French Imperialism. Père Alexandre de Rhodes, a Jesuit, arrived in Indo-China about 1610, and only a decade later was able to send a very accurate description of the possibilities of Annam and Tonkin. French Jesuits were promptly recruited and were sent to help him in his double work of converting those nations to the Catholic faith and of exploring the commercial potentialities of these regions for the French Crown. These tasks, in the eyes of both Rome and Paris, could not be separated, being the two most important stepping-stones which would lead eventually to the political and military occupation of these countries.

The success of the missionaries was such that by 1659 Indo-China was marked as an exclusive sphere of French activity, both in the commercial and in the religious fields.

Subsequently missionaries, in their dual role as agents of the Catholic Church and of French Imperialism, extended their activities into Pegu, Cambodia, Annam, and Siam. Siam, being the most highly developed country of the Indo-Chinese peninsula, was soon designated as the paramount base for the religious, commercial, and political activities of both the East India Company and the Vatican. Their design concerning its complete conquest was simple: each would contribute to the Siamese subjugation according to its means—that is to say, the Company through its commerce, the French Government

through its armies, and the Vatican through its religious penetration.

When the first preparatory steps had been successfully taken by the French Government's establishment of commercial bases and the Vatican's erection of missionary stations, the second steps were undertaken. These consisted of the French Government's attempt to conclude an official trade alliance with Siam, simultaneously with the Vatican's effort to use its spiritual influence, not so much by converting the populace as by concentrating upon the conversion of a single person: the Siamese King himself. It was reckoned that if this could be accomplished, it would then be the task of Catholic priests to persuade the new Catholic king to admit French garrisons into the key cities of Mergui and Bangkok upon the pretext that this was in the best interests of the Catholic Church.

In 1685 the French Government achieved the first objective. Having dispatched a mission to Siam, it concluded a favourable trade alliance with its ruler. Two years later this was followed by a second mission. Its objective: the conversion of the Siamese King to Catholicism.

The combined Vatican-French plans, however, after a while became so obvious that a wave of anti-foreign, anti-Catholic, and anti-Christian feeling, which began at Court, swept the entire nation. French officials and all Catholic priests—with the exception of the few who succeeded in hiding—were promptly expelled, French commerce ceased entirely, missionary work was stopped, and persecution commenced. The French-Vatican bid for the political and religious control of Siam ended in 1688. Result: for a whole century and a half Siam became practically a forbidden land to both.

.

An even more striking instance of the use of this type of policy, which was to have very profound repercussions in the world, was provided by Vatican intrigues in relation to Japan.

As in Siam, its diplomacy did not rely solely on diplomatic or semi-diplomatic instruments to gain a foothold in the Nipponic Islands; it used purely religious ones—that is to say, missionaries—in intimate co-operation with the commercial interests of Catholic countries; Vatican diplomacy acting on

the assumption that, whereas commercial expansion meant Catholic expansion, the reverse was also the case. This reciprocal strengthening being bound eventually to lead to the erection of a wholly Catholic society, via either conversion of the population, economic and religious pressure, military subjugation of the country, or by means of a combination of all these.

In its relations with Japan, therefore, the Vatican's policy was to see that Catholic merchants and Catholic priests worked together so that both, by extending their own interests, should ultimately extend those of the Catholic Church.

Contrary to popular belief, when Japan first came into contact with the West she was eager for the interchange of ideas and commercial commodities. Indeed, foreign merchants were encouraged to call at Japanese ports ever since the first chance landing of the Portuguese in Japan. Local potentates surpassed one another in opening their provinces to Western merchants.

Western merchants, however, were soon followed by Western priests and Catholic missionaries, no less welcome than the traders, who set about spreading the Catholic faith in the new land.

Catholic missionaries found a powerful protector in Nobunaga, the military dictator of Japan (1573-82), who, to check the political power of a certain Buddhist movement composed of Buddhist soldier-priests, but also in genuine sympathy for the work of the Christians who were newcomers, encouraged them to such an extent that in addition to granting them the right to propagate their religion throughout the Empire, donated them land in Kyoto itself, and further, even promised them a yearly allowance of money.

Thanks to this, in no time the Catholic missions had spread far and wide throughout the country; converts were made by the thousand, and soon considerable Catholic centres came into being in various parts of Japan.

Had the Catholic missionaries confined themselves exclusively to preaching religious principles, it is likely that Japan would have yielded them tremendous spiritual rewards. But Catholicism, owing to its religious intransigence, according to which the Catholic Church must dominate her members in

religious, moral, social, and hence political matters, soon brought into play its political claims—that is to say, once a Catholic community was established the juridical-diplomatic-political domination of the Vatican came to the fore. The Catholic Church did not permit, as is explicit in her doctrines, the Japanese converts to remain the subjects only of the Japanese civil authorities. The mere fact that they had entered the Catholic Church made them also the subjects of the Pope. Once their loyalty was transferred outside Japan, automatically they became potentially disloyal to the Japanese civil rulers.

This brought serious dangers to both the internal and the external security of the Japanese Empire. For Japanese Catholics, by virtue of the fundamental Catholic tenet that only Catholicism is the true religion, whenever it was in their power to do so, initiated religious intolerance and, indeed, attempted to obliterate other religions by violence. This, of course, meant civil strife.

In the external field Japanese communities, by following the directives of foreign missionaries, had to favour not only the commercial interests of Catholic foreign merchants but also the political plans of Catholic Powers intent on political and military penetration of the Orient.

This formed the basic strategy of Vatican diplomacy, as a Catholic Power in control of a pagan land would, by giving the Catholic Church religious and political supremacy, enable her to establish uncontested dominion over all.

Consequently, the non-Japanese, religious-political loyalty of Japanese Catholics soon menaced Japan's security.

Not many years had elapsed since the appearance of the first Catholic missionaries when Japanese civil rulers began to realize that the Catholic Church was not only a religion, as they had thought at first, but also a political Power whose interests were intimately connected with those concerning the expansion of imperialistic Catholic countries like Portugal, Spain, and other Western Christian nations.

The nefarious tenet of Catholicism that only the truth is right and that error must not be tolerated also produced its fruits in newly discovered Japan. For wherever Catholic converts were made and Catholic communities expanded, Catholic intolerance raised its head. Wherever Japanese Catholics

formed a majority, the Buddhists and members of other local faiths suffered. Not only were they boycotted, but their temples were closed and, when not destroyed, were seized and converted into churches. In numerous cases Buddhists were forcibly compelled to become Christians, their refusal resulting in loss of property and even of life.

The tolerant attitude of the Tokugawas, Japanese rulers, when faced with such behaviour suddenly changed, and from 1614 onwards Ieyasu adopted a drastic new policy towards Christianity. All converted Japanese were ordered to abandon the new faith; Christian churches and monasteries were demolished, their estates confiscated, and all foreign priests were ordered to leave their missions and proceed to Nagasaki for deportation.

An added reason, closely connected with the jurisdictional claims of the Vatican upon all Catholics and with its political ambition for domination via imperialistic Catholic nations, had been the cause of such a drastic policy.

A few decades before, and only a few years after the Catholic missionaries had been welcomed in Japan, the Vatican, on hearing of the phenomenal success of Catholicism in the distant empire, set in motion its plan based upon political domination. Such domination was to be accomplished, as in many other cases, by the working simultaneously of two of the basic strategies of Vatican diplomacy: the use of the ecclesiastical administration of the Church, together with the military power of allied Catholic countries eager to bring the cross, the Pope's sovereignty, profitable wares of an exotic kind and commercial treaties to Japan in the same galleons.

The first the Vatican operated under the pretence of co-ordinating the religious machinery of the Church, as a purely religious issue, as it did in China. In reality, however, this co-ordination was of the most blatant character; for as soon as the new Japanese Catholics had been integrated into the ecclesiastical administration they had to obey their foreign missionaries who, in their turn, had allegiances both to the Pope and to their country of origin. Japanese Catholics were automatically pressed by their ecclesiastical superiors, in addition to putting their allegiance to the head of the Catholic Church first, to partake of the allegiance which the Western

missions owed simultaneously to the heads of their own Western native countries. Result: Western missionaries did everything in their power, and with success, to persuade the Japanese converted to sympathize with, befriend, help, and co-operate with Catholic Spanish or Portuguese merchants, armies, and hence expeditions, occupations, and dominion.

This was not restricted merely to the theoretical field. It was a concrete, every-day, definite reality which had served well both Catholic and Western Iberian Imperialism. Wherever Spain and Portugal went, there the Catholic Church became dominant. Wherever the Church sent missionaries, there the Spanish or Portuguese merchants followed with naval squadrons and established settlements which usually ended in territorial occupation.

The Vatican had followed this type of political penetration ever since the discovery of the Americas. Numerous Popes, chief among whom were Alexander VI, with his grant to Spain of all "firm land and islands found or to be found towards India, or towards any other part whatsoever,"² and Leo X, as already mentioned, had in fact blessed, encouraged, and indeed legalized all the conquests and territorial occupation by Catholic Spain and Portugal in the Far East. Japan was included in this Papal benediction of Portuguese and Spanish Imperialism.

When, therefore, Japanese Catholic communities became strong enough to vouch for native support of the secular Catholic power, the Vatican took the first important tactical steps in the establishment of its long-range political stranglehold: their co-ordination, which meant that it set out to use the new Catholic communities in Japan as political instruments in its dealings with Japanese and Western civil authorities in its attempts to further Catholic interests.

To carry out this policy—in 1579—the Vatican sent one of the ablest Jesuits of his time, Valignani, to Japan to organize the Japanese Church along those lines. Valignani's design for a time, of course, remained screened behind purely religious activities and received enthusiastic support from numerous powerful Japanese princes, such as the Princes of Omura, Arima, Bungo, and others, within whose provinces he erected, with their help, colleges, hospitals, and seminaries where

Japanese youth was trained in theology, political literature, and science.

Once Catholic exertions had penetrated deep enough into the religious, educational, and social structures of the provinces of these princes, Valignani took his next most important step with a view to ensuring their political allegiance to the Vatican. The work he had accomplished and the number of Japanese Catholics, combined with the social and political weight which they already exerted, finally persuaded the princes to act in accordance with what Valignani counselled them to do. Result: they sent an official embassy to the Pope.

When in 1590 the embassy returned to the Japanese islands the situation there had altered drastically. Hideyoshi, the new master of Japan, having become keenly conscious of the political implications of Catholicism and its allegiance to a distant Western religious-political potentate like the Pope, decided to unite with Buddhism, which owed no political allegiance to any prince outside Japan.

The events which had brought about the changes had been indicative of the shape of things to come had the Japanese rulers permitted Catholicism to take root too deeply. In 1587 Hideyoshi, having visited the island of Kyushu, to his indignation and astonishment found that the Catholic community there had not only become wholly intolerant of other religions but had actually carried on the most appalling persecution of the Buddhists. Everywhere he saw the ruins of Buddhist temples and broken Buddhist idols. The Catholics, in fact, had forcibly attempted to make the whole island of Kyushu totally Catholic. When, in addition to this, an embassy was dispatched to the Pope, Hideyoshi made up his mind. Having condemned the attacks that the Catholics had made upon the Buddhists, their religious intolerance, their political allegiance to a foreign Power, and other real misdemeanours, he gave all foreign Christians an ultimatum whereby they had just twenty days in which to leave Japan. Churches and monasteries were pulled down in Kyoto and Osaka, as retaliation for similar deeds perpetrated by the Catholics upon the Buddhists, and troops were sent to Kyushu.

These were precedents made by the Tokugawas when, in 1614, all Catholic foreign priests were ordered to be deported

once more. The injunction was caused not only by the repetition of forced Catholic conversions, but also by an even more serious issue. The Catholic missionaries, besides fostering religious intolerance among the Japanese, had begun to fight a most bitter war against each other. Vicious quarrels between the Jesuits and the Franciscans had split the Christian communities themselves. Japanese Christians supported now the former, now the latter. These feuds became so dangerous that the Japanese ruler feared they would lead to civil war. Civil war in those times spelt an even graver danger: the intervention of the Portuguese and Spaniards to protect either the Jesuits or the Franciscans. This would have led to the disembarking of foreign armies and hence a possible loss of Japan's independence. Was this fear exaggerated? The tremendous expansion of Catholic Portugal and Catholic Spain was there to prove that the danger was a real one. The subjugation of the Asiatic countries they had already conquered had been accomplished first by the introduction of missionaries, who had been the stepping-stones for the coming of merchants, and subsequently by the sending of armies.

The coming of the Franciscans as special envoys from the already subjugated Philippines in 1593 caused Hideyoshi no end of alarm. The Franciscans, notwithstanding the ban on Christian propaganda, constructed churches and convents in Kyoto and Osaka, defying the authority of the State. To complicate matters, they began to quarrel with the utmost violence with the Portuguese Jesuits, a quarrel which finally provoked a climax in 1596. What at last made Hideyoshi take energetic measures was a small but significant incident.

In that year a Spanish galleon, the *San Felipe*, was shipwrecked off the province of Tosa. Hideyoshi ordered that the ship, with its goods, should be confiscated. The order angered the Spanish captain who, wishing to impress or intimidate the Japanese officials, indulged in some boasting about how Spain had acquired a great world empire. To prove his words the captain showed the Japanese officials a map with all its great Spanish dominions. His hearers in astonishment asked him how it had been possible for a nation to subjugate so many lands. The Spanish captain boasted that the Japanese would never be able to imitate Spain, simply because they had no

Christian missionaries, and he confided that all Spanish dominions had been acquired by first sending missionaries into the various countries to convert their people, after which the Spanish troops followed so as to co-ordinate the final conquest.

When this conversation was reported Hideyoshi's anger knew no bounds. His suspicions about the use of missionaries as a first stepping-stone for the conquest of a country now became a certainty. He believed he detected this pattern of cunning conquest at work within his own empire. Only three years before, the envoy of the Catholic governor of Manila had allegedly recognized Japan's claims on the Philippines; the recognition had been granted on the condition that Hideyoshi permit Spanish missionaries and merchants to enter Japan. Hideyoshi now became certain that the recognition had been only a ruse to get a Spanish *avant-garde* into his realm.

In 1597 both Franciscans and Dominicans came under the Imperial ban. Twenty-six priests were rounded up in Nagasaki and executed. After which an order expelling all foreign preachers of Christianity was issued. In 1598 Hideyoshi died, and Catholic exertions were resumed with renewed vigour and were continued for almost another two decades, until in 1616 Jeyasu became ruler of Japan and enforced even more sternly his predecessor's expulsion edict. Foreign priests were again ordered to leave Japan, and the death penalty was inflicted on Japanese Christians who did not renounce Christianity. This persecution took a more violent turn under Jemitsu (1623-51), when in 1624 all Spanish merchants and missionaries were ordered to be deported immediately. Japanese Christians were warned not to follow the missionaries abroad and Japanese merchants not to trade any longer with Catholic Powers. To make certain that these decrees were respected, all seaworthy ships which could carry more than 2,500 bushels of rice were to be destroyed. The Government decided to stamp out Catholicism in Japan, and further edicts in 1633-4 and in 1637 wholly proscribed all foreign religion in the Japanese islands.

At this point the Catholics in Japan began to organize themselves for violent resistance. This broke out in the winter of 1637 in Shimbara and on the nearby island of Amakusa—regions which had become wholly Catholic, mostly voluntarily

but, in the early days, also by the use of forcible conversion. These Catholic communities began to arm and, led by their Western priests, to organize themselves in military fashion to fight against the Government.

The Japanese Government, fearing that these Catholic groups might eventually ally themselves with Western Catholics and that the Portuguese might use them as a means of advancing the territorial conquest of Japan, taxed them to the point of destitution. The Jesuits, who meanwhile had been preparing for physical resistance, set on foot a Catholic army of 30,000 Japanese; thereupon, with standards bearing the names of Jesus, Maria, and St. Iago fluttering before them, they marched against the civil and military representatives of the Japanese Government, fighting bloody battles along the promontory of Shimbara near the Gulf of Nagasaki. Having murdered the loyal Governor of Shimbara, the Catholic army shut itself in his well-constructed fortress and held out against the forces which the Japanese Government had meanwhile dispatched against the Catholic rebels.

The guns and ships of the Japanese forces, however, soon proved too small and ineffective against the massive walls of the fortress. Thereupon the Government asked the Protestant Dutch to lend them ships for carrying the heavy guns needed for bombarding the Catholic fortress. The Dutch consented, and indeed helped the Japanese to bombard the citadel until it was finally destroyed and practically all the Catholics in it were massacred.

The immediate result of the Catholic rebellion was the Exclusion Edict of 1639. This read :

For the future, let none, so long as the Sun illuminates the World, presume to sail to Japan, not even in the quality of ambassadors, and this declaration is never to be revoked, on pain of death.

The Edict included all Westerners with one exception, the Dutch, who had earned their privilege of remaining by aiding the defeat of the Catholic rebellion. Nevertheless, even they were put under extreme restrictions owing simply to the fact that although they were not Catholics they were Christians. To the Japanese, anything connected with Christianity had become so suspect of double-dealing, conquest,

intolerance, and deceit that the Dutch themselves had to move their headquarters to the tiny island of Deshima, in Nagasaki Bay, where they lived almost as prisoners, being permitted to set foot in Japan proper only once a year. The most forcible restrictions, however, concerned Christianity's religious ceremonies. The Dutch were not permitted to use Christian prayers in the presence of a single Japanese subject. The Japanese had become so incensed with anything which even reminded them of Christianity—which, by now, represented in their eyes nothing but the tortuous Western device for political and military domination—that the Dutch had even to cease from using the Western calendar with regard to their business documents, because it referred to Christ.

When, finally, the Dutch signed a trade agreement, among its seven points those connected with Christianity loomed paramount. The agreement stipulated that :

1. Commerce between Japan and Holland was to be perpetual.
2. No Dutch ship should carry a Christian of any nationality or convey letters written by Christians.
3. The Dutch should convey to the Japanese governor any information about the spreading of Christianity in foreign lands that might be of interest.
4. If the Spaniards or Portuguese seized countries by means of *religious machination*, such information should be given to the Governor of Nagasaki.³

In addition to this, all books, especially those dealing with religious subjects, belonging to Dutch ships had to be put into trunks, sealed, and turned over to the Japanese during the period the ship was in port. The Dutch, who at first were permitted to sail seven ships a year, were later restricted to one.

The Japanese went even further, their suspicion of the perversity and cunning of Christians having become so profound that they even strengthened the first edicts by new ones, making it a criminal offence for any Christian ship to seek refuge in a Japanese port; indeed, for any Christian sailor to be shipwrecked off the coast of Japan.

To all intents and purposes Japan had become a sealed land,

“hermetically” closed to the outside world. It remained sealed in this way for about two hundred and fifty years, until the day when Commodore Perry, in the middle of the last century, opened the gates of the Land of the Rising Sun in unmistakable Western fashion—by pointing against the recluse nation the yawning mouths of heavy naval guns.⁴

The political ambition of the Vatican, by causing the sealing off of Japan, was thus responsible for directing the history of Asia along a path that led to incalculably nefarious results, up to our very day.

The impact of the Vatican's distorted Christianity, which first left its marks upon the Far East, is not yet spent. On the contrary, it is still playing a role of supreme importance in the fostering of that Asiatic resistance to Christianity which is becoming ever more obviously evident throughout that continent.

A religion like organized Christianity which, while preaching the brotherhood of man, is shamelessly supporting Western aggressiveness will never conquer Asia. Those most un-Christian deeds of the Popes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and of the Americans, typified by Perry's gunboats in the nineteenth century and the “experimental” massacre of the atom-bombs of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the twentieth, have made too profound an impression upon the Asian mind to be dismissed as not being the typical by-products of Western and Christian ruthlessness. The concrete effects of the brazen association of Christianity with a Western racial superiority-complex, Western aggressiveness and hypocrisy are there to be seen by all. It is because of these that, notwithstanding the tremendous efforts of both Catholics and Protestants, Christianity, instead of growing in proportion to the increase of the Asiatic population, is fast decreasing. Not only in China, where Christianity and dollars for decades supported reaction in the person of a Christian, Chiang Kai Shek; not only in India or Pakistan which, after a two-centuries' struggle, unsaddled an alien imperialism in the shape of a Western Christian country; but also in Japan itself, after it had been occupied by another Christian Power, the U.S.A., following

the Japanese collapse at the end of the Second World War.

If Christianity had ever had an opportunity of being practised by those claiming to be the defenders of Christian civilization and all that the Christian West stood for, here was one. But, as always in the past so also now, genuine Christianity with Western Christians proved to be a myth. Christianity again meant Western interests. It was preached by a most "Christian" General, representing a most "Christian" power, the U.S.A., quoting not chapter and verse from the Christian gospels, but the ever-more-formidable American Navy, Air Force, their pile of atom-bombs, American strategic bases, and their determination to exterminate the whole of non-Christian Asia with a view to saving "Western American Christian Civilization."

The result was that Japan, dominated by Christians, watching Christianity in action at close quarters, not only was not impressed but actually began to reject Christianity with growing firmness. There were fewer converts to Christianity than ever since the beginning of the twentieth century, although the Americans spent over 10,000,000 dollars within five years to make converts in Japan alone (1946-51). The triumphant prophecy of Christian General MacArthur that Japan would be Christian within a decade⁵ (1945-55), and that of the Roman *Propaganda Fide* that Catholicism would become the dominant influence in the new Japan proved, not so much the failure of rash prophecies, but the abysmal blindness still blanketing the Western Christian mind.

Such Western blindness and conceit could not have been more pithily set forth than by the false hopes raised after the American occupation by the demand for Bibles which, since the coming of the Christian occupiers, within a short time were selling on the black market at five times their fixed price. Catholics and Protestants alike looked upon such a phenomenon as the most astounding proof of the swift Christianization of Japan. Then it was discovered that the rising prices were due, not to the words of wisdom which the Christians preached and never practised, but to the value of the rice-paper, on which the Christian books were printed, as wrapping for hand-made cigarettes.⁶

Non-Christian Asia could not have shown more effectively

its scorn for official Christianity and all that it stood for than by that small but very significant example.

A continent into which the bloody claws of the Christian White race have so often been dug during the last half millennium could not do otherwise than contemptuously reject a religion everlastingly identified with Western greed and Western-promoted wars.

The rejection of Christianity is portentous, not only for Christianity as such, or even for the West, but even more for Asia itself. For Asia, instead, has already accepted another Western message: the message of Communism.

The sooner genuine Christianity disowns organized Christianity and its twin, Western Imperialism, the sooner it might stand a chance to compete with the new faith preached so recently by Marx.

The Catholic Church, having poisoned Christianity from the first day of her contacting the Orient, now as ever has remained its main contaminator. Her stubborn promotion of hate crusades, her ever-more-intimate association with Western ideological and military aggressiveness, her unquenchable thirst for power, is contributing now as in the past to the defeat of genuine Christianity throughout the East.

This, besides her own defeat and that of all other Christian denominations throughout Asia, has caused and is continuing to cause, the ever-widening gap which already yawns so fearfully between East and West, to the dismay of the bewildered masses, the perennial victims of religious and military Powers lusty for more glory and for even more Eastern and Western blood.

THE PATTERN OF VATICAN
MACHINATIONS AGAINST EUROPE
BETWEEN THE SECOND AND
THIRD WORLD WARS

CONTEMPORARY POLITICS, LIKE PEACE, are indivisible. The designs of the Vatican, transcending as they do all boundaries, are made to embrace, perhaps more than those of any other Power, not only single nations, but whole groups of nations and, indeed, continents.

In virtue of this they are promoted in diverse regions, being simultaneously interlocked and interdependent.

In the years following the Second World War, the Vatican, while fostering its grandiose plans with leading American forces, at the same time promoted others, no less necessary for the successful completion of the new joint Vatican-U.S.A. grand strategy. These envisaged, first the neutralization, secondly the strengthening, and thirdly the swift transformation of Europe into a mighty fortress-continent, to serve as a defensive-offensive bastion for a rapidly mobilizing anti-Bolshevik West.

The feverish exertions of the Vatican, initiated by the

tumbling of Mussolini and the attempt to remove Hitler, as the pattern of the post-War world began to unfold soon looked what they were also to the U.S.A. Result: a swift reorientation of American foreign policy until this was made to run parallel with that of the Vatican.

The acceptance of such an originally Vatican-inspired strategy soon forced the U.S.A. to follow policies antipathetic to the very principles and practice of that democracy it claimed to protect. And, more than this, to pursue policies which, being in accordance with the essence of Catholic tenets and therefore perforce hostile to genuine democracy, were promoted, ironically enough, by the generous use of the prestige, monetary funds, and often plain political corruption of the U.S.A.

The pursuance of such a joint policy was not always done through intricate diplomatic jockeying, as instanced by the saddling of fanatical Catholic Adenauer in Western Germany. There have been cases when the Vatican attempted, as far as lay in its power, to foil the will of the people simply by preventing a country working certain changes not in consonance with that country's political designs.

This it did with varying success in more than one European region. Being part of the pattern of its post-War strategy, such exertions fitted into its grand scheme and thus into the U.S.A.-Vatican policy already examined. Hence they deserve mentioning, as without them the scrutiny of its machinations would be only partial and incomplete.

.

The ideal government, in the eyes of the Vatican, is some form of authoritarian rule, not excluding plain dictatorship. The Vatican's predilection for some form of totalitarianism has sprung, not only from Catholic doctrines, which justify it, but also from its long experience, which has taught it that it is much easier to rule with the co-operation of a friendly dictator than through a democratic government, subject to the unpredictable will of the people, which often is not that of the Church. Where there is neither dictatorship nor authoritarianism, it will support the institution most resembling it—i.e. a monarchy. Absolute monarchy being a thing of the past, the

Vatican will back a constitutional one, as a king, even when reduced to a mere figurehead, if well-disposed, can still be very useful to the Church.

In the years following the Second World War, the kings who remained upon their thrones were few. The few were unpopular. In several nations the people decided to get rid of them.

If this was attempted where Catholicism had any power, there the Vatican tried to foil the popular will, with the tacit or even open connivance of the U.S.A. One striking example: that of the House of Savoy's King Victor and his son King Umberto.

The House of Savoy was never very popular in Italy. It was even less so at the Vatican, one of its kings having in 1870 wrested Rome from the Popes. In 1922 King Victor asked an ex-Socialist, Mussolini, to form a government. From then onwards the fortunes of the House changed. It was befriended by the Vatican, but became more unpopular with the people. After the Second World War demonstrations against the King, because of his twenty years' close support of the Fascist regime, became so frequent that finally Victor decided to abdicate. The decision was most unwelcome at the Vatican, which promptly set in motion a policy epitomized in the motto: No abdication lest the Monarchy fall. The Italian hierarchy were briefed. And immediately cardinals, bishops, and priests began to urge the people to support the King. Pulpits became Royalist platforms, the Catholic Press Royalist organs, the Pope gave more than one paternal piece of advice about the beautiful future in store for a nation crowned by a respected kingship. Result: the anti-monarchical demonstrations increased. The King once more made it known that he wished to abdicate, and again the Vatican restrained him from doing so. Bickering between Pius XII and Victor continued unabated for some time, until, the political situation having become unbearable, Victor informed His Holiness that he did not want any more interference from the Curia.

The Pope asked the King to visit him; a visit which was duly paid and during which the monarch was granted a Papal sermonizing on the duties of kings, meant to impress upon him that his abdication would seriously jeopardize, not only

Italy's political future, but also vaster political schemes. The abdication would go against the decision of the Allies, said the Pope. Had the King forgotten how Conservative Churchill had fought Roosevelt for the retention of the House of Savoy? ¹

King Victor listened to the pious Pius, heard the increasing roar of popular tumult, and abdicated.

The Vatican was chagrined. Not, however, as much as it might have been. For, although defeated, it had managed, contrary to insistent popular demand, to prevent the total abolition of the Monarchy, which at first it was taken for granted would occur with the stepping down of King Victor. The Monarchy remained, and the Italian masses were saddled with another king, Umberto, Victor's son.

The move was meant to save the House of Savoy from obliteration. If the new King, who had not been associated with Fascism as prominently as had his father, could survive the initial popular storm, King and Monarchy would be preserved.

At this, popular discontent grew with alarming celerity. The Italian people insisted that the issue of the preservation or abolition of the Monarchy be settled neither by the Vatican nor by Umberto, but by a plebiscite. The Government unwillingly had to bow, with the result that the Vatican soon saw its policy endangered even more than before. The pro-King campaign of a few weeks previously was repeated. The Italian hierarchy were briefed again, and all the vast Catholic machinery mobilized.

Before the polling took place (May, 1946), the Vatican tried so brazenly to influence popular opinion that even the Government, whose Premier was a Catholic, judged it opportune to protest at the extraordinary Church intervention in the political affairs of the country. The Pope came again to the fore, urging Catholics to vote for King Umberto. Not content with this, he significantly bestowed on him the Papal blessing, going so far as to indicate that those who would vote against him would commit a grave sin.

Although the most bigoted Catholics voted *en bloc* for Umberto, the popular forces defeated both the Monarchy and the Vatican. The plebiscite decreed that Italy become a Republic.

After this decision there should have been no further delay in either King Umberto abdicating or the Government declaring Italy a Republic. The Vatican, however, decided otherwise. As soon as the result of the plebiscite became known it began to exert increasing pressure upon the Catholic Party, the Catholic Ministers who formed the Government, and, above all, upon King Umberto, urging them to flout the will of the people. Umberto, a pious Catholic bigot, followed the Pope's advice, and refused to abdicate.

At this, popular discontent started to turn into violence. Both the Government and the people accused Umberto of bad faith. Riots occurred. The threat of civil disorder loomed menacingly upon the nation. Umberto, instead of heeding the warning, declared that he was going to stay. A bunch of army officers and of the degenerate Roman nobility appeared in his support. After a while, however, another ally, the true inspirer of his resistance, came once more to the fore: the Vatican. The Vatican not only had the impudence to justify the King's action, it actually went so far as to urge the Italians to disown their own verdict, explaining why the retention of the Monarchy was so necessary. It was so necessary because it would serve as a defence against the forces of disorder, represented by the Reds.

King Umberto's Pacelli-inspired, unintelligent mulishness, and the Vatican's brazen siding with him, enraged the people. Riots broke out in most parts of the country, and talk of organized popular violence unless the plebiscite was respected was too serious to be disregarded. King Umberto was forced to abdicate and to leave the country.

"It is inadmissible to be a deserter, an *émigré à l'intérieur*," commented, not long afterwards, His Holiness, making it crystal clear that for him the Royal issue was not yet closed, and, significantly enough, addressing the Roman aristocracy. "That is the attitude of the man who withdraws far from the battle while his country's fate is at stake. The just man is a Christian . . . who will feel it his duty to resist, prevent the catastrophe, or at least to circumscribe its damage. He will be there to rebuild." 2

At such Papal encouragement, Royalist agitations flickered again into the open; Royalist plots were hatched; an illegal

monarchical movement soon appeared. Its immediate aim: the restoration of the Monarchy. Its long-range policy: the setting up of a Corporative State, as preached by the Church (read, abolition of the newly born Italian democracy).

It may have been only a coincidence, but many Italians could not help noticing that almost all its supporters were fervent members of the Catholic Church. Also that a tiny group of its leaders were Americans of Italian origin, generously distributing lire to individuals and papers, more than one openly boasting that at the American Embassy the goodwill was unlimited for those who took active trouble to co-operate.

One of the main characteristics of Vatican diplomacy is persistency. The set-back it suffered in Italy, far from reducing its support for unpopular Catholic monarchs, made it more determined than ever to repeat its attempts should the opportunity arise. And, in fact, the opportunity arose a few years later—in Belgium.

The issue was the return from abroad of King Leopold. During the Second World War King Leopold had been the main instrument of Belgian surrender. The surrender had been not only a matter of weaker military force being overwhelmed by an irresistible one. It had been accelerated by the intrigues of powerful Fascist sympathizers, almost all of whom were fervent Catholics.

These elements—among whom were the members of a Fascist Catholic Party, the Rexist—prior to the Second World War had intrigued with Hitler, with the view eventually to setting up a Belgian Catholic totalitarian regime. Their chance of success was a good one. For, although not directly supported by the King, they could use his power almost at will. This, thanks mostly to the fact that Leopold, with little political acumen, was under the political thumbs of the Belgian Primate and the Papal Nuncio. It was the latter who, via the Primate, it can be said without exaggeration at that critical period, influenced the course of Belgian destiny more than any other person, including the royal individual himself.

The Vatican's policy aimed at preventing Belgium—as it did

with France—from siding with the Allies; or, if that failed, bringing about a quick surrender to the Nazi armies.³

The King, consequently, was invaluable for the pursuance of such a policy. Previous to the outbreak of the war, he had been persuaded by his Catholic counsellors to refuse, until it was too late, to join French and British experts in devising the necessary military plans for Belgium's defence. After the outbreak of the War (September, 1939), but before the West was attacked, the Pope himself encouraged him in such a policy, by publicly sending him a message in appreciation of his efforts "to restore peace"—which, when deciphered, was in reality a blessing to all those secretly engaged in intrigues with Hitler (November 14, 1939). With such encouragement, not only did Leopold scorn the co-operation of the Allies, but, when Hitler invaded Belgium, contrary to the unanimous advice of the whole Government and flouting the very Constitution which he had sworn to respect, he surrendered the Belgian Army to the Nazis.

The surrender has remained a most controversial issue ever since. Whether it was a military necessity or not, it is not for us to say. What, however, must be taken into consideration is the part played, previous to, during, and after it, by the Vatican's diplomatic representatives. These—namely, the Papal representative in Belgium and the Belgian Primate—not only conducted prolonged secret negotiations with the leaders of the Catholic factions which wanted an accord with Hitler, but had protracted secret conversations on the matter with King Leopold himself.

Immediately after the surrender, and *before* the country had been informed of it, Cardinal Van Roey had an extremely private interview with the King, lasting for over an hour and a half. In addition to this, it should be noted that the King, in spite of pressing military problems, had previously had a very private meeting with the Papal Nuncio as well. The capitulation was immediately followed by that ominous meeting. It was in such circumstances, and employing Cardinal Van Roey as his mouthpiece, that the King finally announced the Belgian collapse on May 28, 1940. After the announcement the text of two letters was published. One was addressed to President Roosevelt and the other, significantly

enough, to the Pope. Belgium became a satellite of the Nazi New Order.

At this juncture King Leopold—again scorning the unanimous advice of the Belgian Government, i.e. to leave Belgium to continue the war from abroad—voluntarily surrendered himself to Hitler. While officially a war prisoner he paid two private visits to leading Nazi leaders, including Hitler himself, to whom on one occasion he even sent a congratulatory telegram.

Such behaviour shocked most Belgians, who disowned him. As Royal unpopularity continued to grow, the Vatican ordered the Belgian bishops to publish pastoral letters urging the people to remain united round the King, "who incarnates still the principle of sovereignty and on whom rests the hope of the fatherland" (Pastoral letter, 1940).

The support of the Church lasted throughout the War, while, it should be noted, the King indirectly, through some of his most trusted friends (e.g. his Secretary, Count Capelle), dealt not only with collaborationist and Nazi journalists, but with the Catholic Fascist Party, the Rexists, who went so far as to form a Catholic Walloon unit, which fought side by side with the Nazis on the Russian Front.

At the end of the War, in 1945, the Belgian Parliament passed a law which declared that the King was "unable to reign," and set up a Regency. One morning, however, after an absence of six years, Leopold landed at a heavily guarded airfield and drove through the streets—lined exclusively with 8,000 troops and police—to his quarters (July, 1950).

As soon as his arrival became known—the Primate had been informed of it two days previously—the bells of Brussels Cathedral and of most churches rang peals of welcome. A nation-wide campaign in favour of the King was promptly promoted by the hierarchy. A divine service at the Cathedral in Brussels, attended by Catholic members of the Government and most of the King's Catholic supporters, was solemnly celebrated. During the service, shouts of "Leopold, Leopold, Vive le Roi!" echoed repeatedly, while the clergy throughout Belgium gave public thanks to God for the King's return.

Most of the Government, with the exception of the Catholic Ministers, resigned in protest. Outside the churches demon-

strations against Leopold and his Catholic supporters broke out throughout the country. Railway lines were damaged, signal wires were cut. Within twenty-four hours thirty-two separate acts of sabotage, including twenty bomb explosions, had taken place. Violence became widespread, street battles grew, people were wounded, and many were killed. The Government took drastic measures. Gatherings of more than five people were prohibited. All Forces' leave was stopped. Occupation troops were brought back from Germany, while army units were put on a war footing and the mobilization of civilians was contemplated.

The nation was soon split to a degree never known before, and Belgium found itself on the brink of a terrible civil war.

The opposition came not only from the streets; it was no less determined among the Deputies, Ministers, and former Prime Ministers. M. Spaak, a former Premier, denounced the King as unwanted and unfit to rule, having "the habit of listening to *other advisers* than to the politicians." This last accusation did not refer to the King's past. It was a direct reference to the present. Leopold, in fact, had returned on the advice of the Vatican, where the move had been planned, in concert with the Catholic Party and the Catholic hierarchy of Belgium.

After Leopold's return, referendums were held, all of which left the issue in doubt, owing mostly to the Church having purposely stultified the voice of the people by religious-political pressure from the pulpits and the Catholic Press, and the promotion of a tremendous pro-Leopold campaign. The King's stubbornness and the Church's support infuriated the otherwise moderate Belgians. Popular demonstrations grew in violence. More people were killed. Several Catholic leaders, including some bishops, advised caution. As a reply, the Vatican ordered the Belgian hierarchy to continue their pro-King agitation.

When, finally, the situation became unbearable, the King himself, like his Italian colleague, decided to abdicate. The Vatican, the real source of resistance, asked him not to give way as the popular will in the end would have to yield. The King wavered and stayed on. Popular violence increased once more. Leopold's Catholic advisers—the most prominent of

whom were, as always, members of the Belgian hierarchy and their lay representatives—urged him to be firm, going so far as to counsel him to curb popular hostility with force, if necessary. The King, realizing that this would have meant civil war, at last decided to lay the responsibility with the man who was its real promoter, the Pope, and went personally to Rome (June 11, 1950), where he was received in private audience by Pius XII, with whom he discussed the whole situation. Pius XII, that saintly lover of democracy, once more urged the King to resist. This time, however, with a proviso “to accept certain constitutional changes,” so as to appease certain liberal supporters.

The pious Leopold, fortified by the Pope’s good advice and by his Holy Year visit to the Roman Basilicas, returned to Belgium, and, in spite of the saintly Pius XII’s admonition that he must cling to the Belgian throne, cost what it might, even civil war, abdicated. His son, Baudouin, succeeded him. Leopold went, but by so doing saved the Monarchy.

A few days later one of King Leopold’s fiercest opponents, Julien Lahaut, President of the Communist Party, caused an uproar, while Prince Baudouin was being sworn in as head of the State, by shouting “Vive la République!” Shortly afterwards two men drove up to his house in a car. Their knock at the door was answered by Lahaut himself. Four shots were fired into his head (August 19, 1950). One hundred thousand workers went on strike at the news of the assassination. During the funeral another of the Party’s leaders was shot. There were more riots and demonstrations. The assassins, two Catholic Monarchists, were permitted to escape and were never arrested.

Only shortly before, the real inspirer of the Belgian crisis, Pius XII, had uttered some significant words:

Those who arouse the masses and provoke rebellions . . . must understand that the justice demanded by Christian principles is achieved not through force and violence, but with the application of Law.⁴

The lips which uttered them were those of a dangerous hypocrite. And this had been convincingly demonstrated by the role which that same Pope had played not long before in Italy, in 1948, during that country’s fateful general election.

The preservation of monarchies or the retention of kings prompted the Vatican to operate in a very restricted diplomatic field. The promotion of its policy, therefore, having been conducted on the highest level, had little scope for directly stultifying the will of the people, which the Vatican attempted to by-pass obliquely and undetected.

There have been cases, however, when the Vatican has tried—and, in fact, successfully—deliberately to clog the wheels of a working democracy. In one case, it did this to prevent an inimical political party from going into power, to retain a subservient government in office, and, last but not least, to further its vigorous anti-Communist political strategy in Europe.

Since its post-War promotion of this policy, the prospect of a general election in Italy had been contemplated with the gravest anxiety at the Vatican, whose exertions to avert it had resulted only in increasingly perilous postponements which had put the electorate in a rising, dangerous mood. The Government, to avoid a popular explosion, finally fixed the date: some time in 1948.

The Catholics had been in power—although, for brief periods, only partially—practically since the end of the Second World War, their leader, the former Vatican Librarian, having been Premier almost uninterruptedly since the beginning.

The gloom entertained at the Vatican, and consequently in Washington, about the result of the election was justified by the fact that Italy, the seat of the Catholic Church, significantly enough harboured the largest single Communist Party in the world outside Soviet Russia (2,300,000; in 1952, 2,700,000). When to this were added the Socialists, who were playing with the idea of a coalition with the Communists, the chance of the Catholic Party receiving a new mandate to form the government was very small indeed.

The failure of a Catholic return would have had the gravest repercussions, in that Italy, a keystone in the anti-Communist defence system, if Communist-dominated would have imperilled the whole anti-Russian defence framework of America and the Vatican.

Viewed in this light, the election became not only a domestic issue but also an important international one, upon whose

results the grand strategy of the two most powerful political units of the world outside Russia—the U.S.A. and the Vatican—had come to depend. Hence the necessity that the Left be defeated.

This could be done by cowing the electorate to vote for the Right—i.e. for the Catholic Party.

The Vatican set out to do things on a really big scale. Religious, semi-religious, semi-political Catholic organizations, led by Catholic Action, that religious-political mongrel, were mobilized with unprecedented energy throughout the country. The President planned the political strategy with Pius XII, who put at his disposal almost unlimited monetary funds. Special bodies, set up superficially through Catholic Action to swing the election according to the Vatican's will, came into being—e.g. the National Civic Committees.⁵

These were so successful in 1948 that later, in 1952, the Pope enlarged their scope by strengthening them with further monetary and religious-political power, with a view to having them repeat the same feat during the Italian general election of 1953, for which event Pius XII started a crusade early in 1952.⁵ Moreover, he planned its promotion in other countries as well, and for that purpose the N.C.C. President was promoted Secretary of the International Congress for Catholic Action.⁶

In addition to this, the Catholic Press and various Catholic organizations, including the Catholic Party, were mobilized to an extent comparable only with the mass propaganda of the defunct Fascist regime. This can be judged by the fact that some Catholics became so inflamed with religious-political fanaticism that, at this period and subsequently, political assassinations of Communists were attempted and carried out—for example, a Catholic attempted to assassinate Togliatti, the Communist leader, wounding him so badly that he lay between life and death for several months. Parish churches and cathedrals echoed with political speeches; bishops, cardinals, and parish priests urged Italians to vote for the Catholic Party lest the Bolsheviks plunge the country and the world into chaos. When, after weeks of such fear-implanting campaigns, the climax drew near, the Pope himself came to the fore and told preachers in Rome:

It is your right and duty to draw the attention of the faithful to the extraordinary importance of the coming elections, and to the moral responsibility which follows from it for all those who have the right of voting.⁷

Not content with this, he took the unprecedented step of directly addressing the electors:

The voice of conscience imposes on every sincere Catholic the necessity of giving his own vote to those candidates who offer truly adequate guarantees for the protection of the rights of God [he declared]. In the present circumstances . . . it is strictly obligatory for whoever has the right to take part in the elections. He who abstains, commits thereby *a grave sin, a mortal offence*.⁷

Religious terrorization had been once more brazenly used to promote the Vatican's political plans.⁸

This was supplemented, incredible as it may sound, by a no-less-ominous mobilization—that of a substantial portion of the U.S.A., with the precise purpose of putting pressure upon the Italian electors. The campaign, operated by the American hierarchy, clergy, Press, and Catholic organizations, had two objectives: to stir the already hysterical anti-Communist fear within the U.S.A., so as to spur non-Catholic forces to side with the Vatican in its fight against the Reds in Italy, and to persuade Americans, particularly Catholics, to take part in a mass drive from the U.S.A. to influence the electorate in Italy. This drive consisted of letter-writing. Catholics had to write to relations, friends, or, indeed, anyone in Italy, urging them to vote against the Reds. Result: the Italian electors were inundated with missives requesting them to heed such advice. To make them even more persuasive, food parcels were promised to the recipients, and within a few weeks over 1,500,000 parcels reached Italian homes.

But this was only the spectacular side of the American intervention. A less publicized but more effective campaign had been running parallel with it. The Vatican's and the American hierarchy's mobilization of powerful financial and political forces, with a view to persuading them to intervene in the Italian election—this to be done by pressure upon influential Italian politicians, newspapers, and personages in public life.

The secret stultification of Italian democracy was promoted by none other than the official representative of the U.S.A.

The American Ambassador in Rome, in fact, received precise instructions from Washington not to spare either promises or dollars, provided things went according to plan. J. C. Dunn spared neither. Secret dollar funds were distributed profusely to Italian politicians, Catholic, Liberal, and Socialist party men and movements. An extraordinary number of moribund papers became suddenly financially extravagant. The well-informed *Osservatore Romano* pontificated that their sudden prosperity was due to Divine, or rather Catholic, Providence, although in Washington her true function by that time had become so well known that even the dullest office boys of the State Department felt an obvious ennui at the slightest mention of her saintly buttocks having been branded with a red-hot American dollar.

Providence soon helped J. C. Dunn, in the shape of the State Department, which conferred upon him the Distinguished Service Award, plus, later on, an "accolade from Secretary Dean Acheson," for his "work" during the Italian elections of 1948.

As if this were not sufficient, private organizations, mostly Catholic—although non-Catholic ones were also very prominent—sank vast monetary funds in the campaign. Indeed, American individuals did not hesitate to spend great sums to buy Italian electors. One of the most zealous of these came to the fore with a most feverish vigour. He was the most astounding supporter of Vatican anti-Bolshevik strategy, one of its main advocates with the U.S. Government, and, indeed, the most fanatical co-ordinator of Vatican-American post-War policy. For years he had used all his power, both in his official and in his private capacity, to check and destroy the Reds at home, in Europe, in Asia, and, indeed, wherever they could be found. He specialized in open and secret interference in the internal political life of foreign countries, which he considered it his duty to do, as an enemy of Bolshevism and as a Catholic. In 1947, for instance, he had had 18,000 dollars flown overnight to Paris by an American Intelligence officer, to bribe a Communist leader to end the French Transport strike. This man, Catholic born, was so determined upon the annihilation of the Reds that he wanted nothing less than "the custody of the atomic bomb." To that effect he pestered

President Truman to hand the bombs to the military. To get the atom bombs passed over to "the military" and thus to him, he intrigued within and outside the Government, until finally Truman had to stop him by over-ruling him, on the ground that he did not want to leave "some lieutenant-colonel to decide when it would be the proper time to drop one."⁹

When the Italian election arrived, therefore, this dynamic crusader could not but intervene full tilt. He unscrupulously used his official position to give instructions to American personnel in Italy to put pressure upon Italian elements, tied by financial, economic, and political ties to the U.S.A. Not content with this, he put his hand in his pocket and disbursed no less than 54,000 dollars of his private income to bribe, corrupt, and influence Italian electors, papers, and politicians.

His name? One of the highly placed personages of the government of the United States of America, whom we have already met: James Forrestal, the American Secretary of Defence.

When, finally, the polling day arrived, in addition to organizing public prayers, the Vatican mobilized the Catholic population to such an extent that the sick were compelled to allow themselves to be taken to voting posts. The very nuns of perpetual enclosures were made, for the first time in history, to go out into the world with the sole object of casting their votes in accordance with the wish of the Church.

The election went as the Vatican and the U.S.A. had desired. In the U.S.A. it was openly called "an American victory." In Italy, and, indeed, throughout the Catholic world, it was called one of the most "outstanding triumphs" of the Vatican. Cardinals, bishops, and the whole hierarchy openly thanked the Pope for having defeated the Reds. The Pope himself could not remain silent, and during an address—significantly enough, delivered to American newspapermen—he said:

You have just witnessed the passing of a day that will be memorable in the annals of Italian history. An entire people has given proof of its grave sense of civic duty. But that day has also quickened the confidence of all Europe. Yes, and the whole world. Messages reaching us from every continent tell us how our children have turned at this crucial moment to the infinite God, with prayers that He come to the defence of His cause against error and injustice. . . .¹⁰

Shortly afterwards, that zealous defender of Western Christian civilization, James Forrestal, on hearing an aircraft overhead, dashed along a Washington street with a most fateful message. "The Russians are coming, the Russians have invaded us!" he shouted, pointing at the aircraft, a peaceful American air-liner. Later, notwithstanding the assurance of Pius XII that the Italian elections had "quickened the confidence of all Europe, yes, and the whole world," the American Secretary of Defence jumped from a window on the sixteenth floor in the American capital, to escape the pursuing Reds, and was instantly killed.¹¹ The Vatican's and the American dinosaurian Press's fear-propaganda had obtained another spectacular result, besides that of the Italian general election.

One day during the last century a harassed youth ran anxiously about his neighbourhood searching for the Catholic priest to administer the last sacraments to his dying mother, a meek Socialist. The priest, thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Papal encyclicals about Liberalism and Socialism, after having listened refused to go, saying: "Let this Socialist perish with no sacraments."¹² The youth swore to fight for the rest of his life a Church who could exude so uncharitable a spirit.

In 1886, following the discovery of a plot to kill Tsar Alexander III, this same youth was exiled to Siberia for seven years, while other revolutionaries, among them Alexander Ulyanov, Lenin's brother, were hanged. The youth thereupon added another oath to his first one: eternal hatred for Czarist Russia. His name, Joseph Pilsudski.

After the First World War, which made Poland independent, Pilsudski, now a famous man, set himself to fulfil three main goals: the creation of a Poland fit for Polish gentlemen and Catholic bishops to rule; the turning of Poland into a devoted fief of the Catholic Church; and the mobilization of Poland against her neighbour, Bolshevik Russia.

For Pilsudski had greatly changed. The oath he took after his mother's death to fight the Catholic Church was forgotten. It was forgotten with the help of the Catholic Church herself.

This the Church achieved simply by joining with him in his hatred for Russia. Since his rejection of Socialism and Russia's acceptance of Bolshevism, Pilsudski's Russophobia had increased beyond countenance. The Catholic Church, being the fiercest hater of both, Pilsudski sided with her. It was an alliance which lasted to the end.

In 1926 Pilsudski, after a bloody struggle against the legal government of the great peasant leader Witos, seized power by armed rebellion, imprisoned the leaders of the majority parties, and set up a dictatorship. This, in order to transform Poland into an ideal Poland, "for Polish gentlemen, Army colonels, and Catholic bishops to rule."

The Catholic Church had helped him mightily. Hence a reciprocal love, to be shared by all patriotic Poles. In Pilsudski's Poland the day began and ended for every Polish soldier with common prayers by his whole unit. Every event started with Mass, which was compulsory. Communion was organized; military vicars were attached to every garrison; Army bishops were nominated.

The Church was given vast properties. And the Pope, a former Papal Nuncio in Warsaw, in exchange ordered all the Polish hierarchy to give their loyal backing to Pilsudski's dictatorship.

Pilsudski would have deserved perennial Catholic gratitude for all the foregoing. But, in the eyes of the Mother Church, Pilsudski had come to represent more than a mere protector of her interests inside Poland. Pilsudski had sworn besides to fight, to dismember, and, indeed, to destroy Bolshevik Russia. In such a role he was reckoned one of the main pillars of Vatican grand strategy, and was nursed, protected, and helped accordingly.

In the spring of 1920 Pilsudski launched an unprovoked attack against a hopelessly weak Russia, and invaded her, with the blessing of the Papal Nuncio and the support of the Western Allies. The moment was well chosen. The Bolsheviks were already fighting for their lives on three fronts, against the White armies of Kolchak, Denikin, and Wrangel. Pilsudski, advised by the military men of the then strongest military Power to emerge from the First World War—e.g. General Henrys, of France—planned to exploit the Bolshevik

preoccupation with Wrangel and to seize the Russian Ukraine west of the Dnieper; to occupy White Russia and to extend the frontiers of Poland until they stretched from Danzig to Odessa. His grand objective: with Wrangel pressing in the Crimea, the whole Bolshevik system would collapse, and Poland, "a country fit for gentlemen and Catholic bishops to rule," would become the only strong power in a "Balkanized" Russia.

Following the First World War, a coalition of Allies—including France, the most redoubtable military Power of the West—sent their generals, one of whom was the pious, Jesuit-trained Weygand, to help Pilsudski destroy Russia.

Following the Second World War a coalition of Allies—led by the U.S.A., the most redoubtable military Power of the West—set the whole of the Western world afoot to make Pilsudski's dream a reality. It is ominous that, whereas in the political and military fields the U.S.A. supplanted France, in the ideological Poland's inspirational ally remained the same: the Vatican.

As in the case of Western Europe, so also here Vatican-American grand strategy ran parallel. This spelt, in addition to an indissoluble political Vatican-American co-ordination, Vatican-American espionage, sabotage, and joint promotion of anti-Communist underground movements. These were begun in an exceptionally vigorous manner as soon as a new Polish Provisional Coalition Government was formed in 1945. The Vatican not only declared such a government "illegal"; it promoted a veritable war against it. The vast Catholic machinery was mobilized throughout the country. Political forces worked hand-in-hand with the Catholic hierarchy for the downfall of the new Polish administration. All this while the Vatican operated in the Western capitals so as to have the new Poland boycotted in the international field.

The objectives of the Vatican at this period were two: a religious one, the overthrow of the Government and its replacement by a Catholic one; and a political, the satellization of Poland—that is to say, the embodiment of Catholic Poland within a vast political orbit in Central Europe, conceived and supervised by the Vatican, in conjunction with other Central European countries.

The latter objective was the very pivot of Vatican political

scheming in connexion with the role to be played by a "liberated" Catholic Poland "when Russian domination had ended." This meant that, besides the domestic Catholicization of Poland after the Second World War, Poland would simultaneously be subordinated to the vast political plans of the Vatican and hence of the U.S.A. The exertions of both, since the failure of these designs, were directed at reaching such goals. Hence their short-range policy aiming at, in the domestic field, (a) the overthrow of the Communist regime and (b) its replacement by a Catholic one; in the external field, the transformation of Poland into a pawn, to be used on the great Vatican-American dominated chequer-board of Western politics.

The belief of many Polish Catholic individuals that the Vatican has Polish interests at heart is so pathetic as to border on total political blindness. The Vatican has always followed its own interests. This rule it has unscrupulously applied, not only to Catholic Ireland, as we have already seen, but equally to Catholic Poland ever since she became a Christian country.

Without going back into the centuries, suffice it to say that during the 150 years between the first partition of Poland and her resurgence as a sovereign State in 1918, the Poles could never get support from the Vatican during their many bloody risings against the Czar. This sounds almost incredible when it is remembered that the Czar was also the head of the "heretic" Orthodox Church, while Poland was one of the most Catholic countries in the world. Yet a closer examination of the international chequer-board of European politics in those times clearly shows that the reason was the Vatican's jockeying for political power among the great empires of that century. Such disregard for Poland's welfare went so far that Pope Gregory XVI, at the time of the first revolt in 1831, for instance, as well as Pope Leo XIII later on, took the side of Poland's oppressors.

This hurt the Poles to such an extent that many became very bitter against the Pope. Indeed, one of their greatest national poets, Julius Slowacki, was so incensed that he sang a poem which was to become an unprecedented challenge to the political scheming of the Vatican: "Poland, thy doom comes from Rome."

Such a slogan has never been forgotten by the Poles, many of whom have always been aware that their national aspirations seldom receive the benediction of the Vatican. This was proved as late as the First World War, when Roman Dmowski, having gone to Rome to ask for help in his plan for an independent Poland, was greeted with disfavour, if not hostility. Roman Dmowski, later leader of the Polish Nationalists, although a devout Catholic, consistently warned his fellow-countrymen: "Never rely upon the Vatican in political affairs."

A similar warning was given by Colonel Beck, for many years Polish Foreign Minister until the outbreak of the Second World War. After Hitler had attacked and occupied Poland, Colonel Beck, watching the disaster into which his country had fallen, uttered the following significant words:

One of those mainly responsible for the tragedy of my country is the Vatican. Too late do I realize we have pursued a foreign policy for the Catholic Church's own ends. We should have followed a policy of friendship with Soviet Russia and not one of support of Hitler.¹³

A further striking example of Vatican unscrupulousness in sacrificing Poles to further its own political schemes occurred during the Second World War, when Pius XII, from a cautious support of Nazism, switched to blatant wooing of the winning side.

This scheme consisted in manoeuvring Poland in such a way as to enable only Polish Catholics to seize power immediately they were liberated. It culminated in the tragic rising of Warsaw in 1944, when thousands of lives were lost because of the Catholic insurgents' decision to impede the Reds from getting into key positions and to hinder the Russian armies, then approaching the Polish capital, from "liberating" Catholic Poland from the Nazi occupation.

The tragedy of Warsaw, however, instead of deterring its promoters, spurred them to renewed efforts. Underground movements were organized to give Poland the right government. This in order to ensure that Poland, once ruled by Catholics, would play her pre-War role, (a) as a super-Catholic State where the Church would be supreme, and (b) as the promoter of a Central European anti-Soviet *bloc*, allied to the Western powers.

One of the chief organizers of such underground units: General Okulicky, Commander of the Polish Home Army, who began his activities during the Warsaw uprising. "A Soviet victory over Nazi Germany," Okulicky stated, "will place all Europe in fear. It is clear that we should be in the front row of this anti-Soviet *bloc*." ¹⁴

As a reply Russia, the following year, confounded Okulicky's supporters—i.e. Polish-Catholic-Western forces—by disavowing the exiled Polish Government in London. In the spring of 1945 this was followed by the formation of a new Left-Wing government in battered Poland. The new Coalition Government was in due course reluctantly recognized by almost all the Western Powers. Not so by the Vatican, which, ostrich-fashion, simply refused to face the facts, granting full recognition to the former Catholic Polish Government in London, represented at the Vatican by an official ambassador.

If the Vatican's obtuseness had been limited to non-recognition, its refusal would not have unduly preoccupied Poland. But the Vatican ordered all the Polish hierarchy inside Poland to follow suit. Led by Cardinal Hlond, their conduct created serious complications, and the repeated efforts of the government to settle the pressing problems of the changed relationship of Church and State were haughtily spurned. This, however, was not all. The Polish hierarchy, besides inciting the people to rebellion, started to spin various political intrigues in and outside Poland, with a view to bringing about the downfall of the government.

In the summer of 1946 the exiled Catholic Polish Government in London sent a delegate into Poland. His task: to co-ordinate the Polish underground forces and the Polish hierarchy with their equivalents outside Poland.

The Polish hierarchy co-operated to the full, and encouraged the enlistment in anti-government activities of many of its members. E.g. Father Grudzienski,¹⁵ who passed on reports to the British Embassy; Father Matus, member of the illegal Co-ordination Committee; Father Leon Pawlina,¹⁶ director of the Catholic organization *Caritas*, a branch of Catholic Action and hence directly dependent on the hierarchy; Mgr. Z. Kaczynski, a former Minister in the Polish Government in London, who held a meeting of the Christian Democrats in

the offices of the Catholic paper, the *Warsaw Weekly*, with a view to planning the overthrow of the Polish Government.

This was by no means confined to the lower clergy. It included bishops—Bishop Karczmarek, for instance—while Cardinal Hlond and even the Primate of Poland were also vigorously active.

The last two, at this period, had established contact with Włodzimierz Mareszewsky, the leader of the illegal Polish Nationalist Organization, a prominent member of the Co-ordination Committee of the Polish underground movement. Their objective: the overthrow of the Polish Government. This could be done only with help from outside. It was reckoned that such help would come mostly from a considerable Polish Army which had stubbornly refused to disband. Its leader, pious Catholic General Anders, explained that it should not be dissolved on the grounds that it had to be used for the new "liberation" of Poland. Officially, Anders got orders from the exiled Polish Government in London. In reality he had become a Catholic Don Quixote, chasing the ghost windmills of a remodelled semi-Fascist, super-Catholic Pilsudski's Poland.

Parallel with sundry frustrated Catholic generals and scheming bishops, other forces were no less vigorously dreaming ambitious expansionist Catholic anti-democratic dreams. One of the most outstanding of these: the anti-Russian Federation, whose code name was *Isthmus*.

Isthmus had contacts with members in sixteen countries. Its objective: the co-ordination of all North, Central, and Eastern European countries into one single religious ideological bloc. Its promoters envisaged nothing less than the detachment of the southern part of Russia, the latter to be split into independent States, to be eventually incorporated into the Federation.¹⁷

Isthmus had the blessing of the U.S.A. More ominous still, it was directly backed by the Vatican. Vatican support was motivated by the fact that *Isthmus's* political objective—namely, the destruction of the Communist States—would have permitted it to substitute the vanished Communist States by Catholic ones, these to serve as the bulk of a powerful Catholic Central European Confederation.

In the words of one of its leaders, the members of such a Confederation were to be Poland, Hungary, and Austria, followed by Slovakia, Croatia, Estonia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Latvia, and other Balkan countries. Although non-Catholic populations would have been incorporated, the weight of the dominant Catholic countries would have made the Federation wholly Catholic.

That would have spelt Vatican political domination of North, Central, and Eastern Europe. Once these had been centralized in the projected Confederation the latter would, in turn, have been co-ordinated with the various Catholic governments of Western Europe. The combination would have produced a most formidable political *bloc*, which would have transformed the whole of the European Continent into a political field for the Vatican.

The sinister significance of such plans, prior to and after the *Isthmus* project, was that most of them were inspired by forces outside Poland and other Eastern European countries—namely, by the Vatican and the invisible government of the U.S.A.

The portent of *Isthmus* becoming exceptionally active in that very period when, as we have already seen, parallel exertions were being conducted in America and in Europe by the agents of the invisible government of the U.S.A. and by the Vatican was not a coincidence. The Vatican's purpled strategists, their agents in *Isthmus*, counted on establishing their new, Catholic-dominated Central Europe in the wake of American-led European armies of invasion—namely, upon the smoking ruins of a third World War.

These were not mere rodomontades. They were schemes envisaged by the fanaticism of Catholic war leaders. On Soldiers Day, 1946, every man in General Anders's Second Army Corps took a vow: "To continue the struggle for the liberty of Poland." The vow bound them all until Poland was "liberated." In any soldier's mind liberation is accomplished by one means only—by war.

Generals breathe war. And although it is invariably their men who are massacred in the field while they, the "old soldiers," die in their bemedalled beds, being universally acknowledged the most obtuse individuals, they should be listened to with the same respect as is accorded to their

intellectual equivalents, the brilliantly uniformed commissionaires watch-dogging cinemas. Unfortunately, in the last few decades it has become the practice to use generals as the brainless dummies of hidden forces planning for war. Some of their utterances, therefore, at times must be taken in all seriousness. In our case, not a few of them spoke as they did knowing that powerful currents in the West were hoping and, indeed, planning for war.

We have seen how true this was in the U.S.A. In the case of Poland and of Central Europe, its veracity was clearly confirmed once more in 1952. In that year the European Movement, attended by delegates from Central and Eastern Europe, many of whom had come from the U.S.A., mostly former Prime Ministers, Foreign Ministers, and generals, convened in London for a Conference of several days. They had assembled in order "to draw up a blue-print for the future of the 100,000,000 people living behind the Iron Curtain," to be carried out "when Russian domination is ended."¹⁸ Although the delegates restrained their language for fear of "the effect on British public opinion of any appearance of *war-mongering*," yet they made it crystal-clear that such domination must be ended only by one means, by war. "We have already been attacked . . ." said one. "The defence, once one has already been attacked, is not an act of aggression." This because "as peace isn't there, we are at war."¹⁹

Mgr. Bela Varga, President of the Hungarian National Council, counsellor of Cardinal Mindszenty, was even more explicit—"We are in total war," stated Prelate Varga. "The aim of it is total victory; we must, therefore, organize for total defence."

The future plans of the Conference were blatantly pinned upon a third World War, owing to the fact that "everybody present knew that as long as the Soviet regime existed in Russia, freedom for the enslaved people could be won only by the use of force."²⁰ Delegates talked about "after the war," which some corrected to "after the liberation."

The rebuilding of a new Europe, envisaged with so much hope and glee upon the ruins and blood of a third global massacre, after which, as the sober London *Times* sourly commented, the delegates propounding it might well return to

find their liberated countries mere *tabula rasa*,²¹ was not visualized only by Central European politicians at the Conference (of whom, it should be noted, more than two-thirds were devout Catholics, including Catholic priests—e.g. Mr. Mikolajczyk, former Polish Premier, and Mgr. Bela Varga. It was contemplated by influential quarters in the West.

It was ominous that one of the first delegates to talk of “after the war” was a British politician.²² But the presence of British politicians referring to “after the war”—i.e. the third World War—or of bodies such as the “British Free Russia Movement,” created in 1951, although significant, were by no means indicative of official British support of the Movement.

What were truly ominous were the parallel activities inspired and promoted, sometimes under “private” patronage, sometimes with the “official” sanction of the invisible government of the U.S.A.

A few weeks after the London Conference of the European Movement, Admiral Kirk, former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, was elected Chairman of the “American Committee for Liberation of the People of Russia.” Its objective, according to Admiral Kirk himself: to provide material and moral aid “to enable fugitives from Stalin’s tyranny to undertake practical anti-Soviet activities.”²³ The Committee, it should be noted, was a “private organization.” Its chief sponsors: prominent members of the dinosaurian and Catholic American fraternities.

It is noteworthy that Admiral Kirk’s successor in Moscow (1952), Mr. Kennan, had also been head of the Free Russia Committee.

Such Committees, led usually by former American ambassadors, American generals or American industrialists, never arose by spontaneous generation. They were made to germinate via the flux of monetary and ideological hate-fertilization, exuded by that thousand-and-one-headed political monster: the invisible government of the U.S.A.

The most successful of its creatures in this field was undoubtedly the American Mutual Security Act (1951). In virtue of this, as already mentioned, 100,000,000 dollars were allocated by the U.S. Government to help “any selected persons who are residing in . . . the Soviet Union and her satellites [Central European nations] . . . either to form such persons into

elements of the military forces . . . or for other purposes.”

Viewed against such a background, the different schemes for “after the war,” all secretly connected with the individuals or political “creatures” of the invisible government of the U.S.A., assumed even more fearsome meaning, especially when it is remembered that the invisible government was the *de facto* owner of mounting atomic weapons, thanks to the fact that the giant corporations of America robbed the American people of the true control and ownership of American atomic plants.²⁴

In 1951-2-3, at a period when the various European and American Committees of Liberation were mushrooming with increasing vigour, such ownership was strengthened to a degree comparable with the unparalleled dishonesty with which it was camouflaged.

The dinosaurian technique, used with the precise intention of making millions of Americans believe the impossible, was borrowed in its entirety from the Catholic Church. It rested upon the assumption that the American people’s intellectual capacity was of such a low standard that they could be made to swallow a “miracle” of no less colossal proportions than that of Pius XII’s zigzagging sun.

The “miracle”? The most rapacious giant trust of the U.S.A. had become suddenly “patriotic.” That was not all. It had turned simultaneously “unselfish.” A miracle of the first water, even by Vatican standards. But the most astounding feature of it all was that at the same time it had also disowned the “profit motive.” The religious equivalent would have been if the Pope had suddenly publicly disowned his belief in God. Last, but not least, it had made it understood that this portentous transformation had occurred because of the burning love it nursed for the American people. Inspired by such love, the great dinosaur, like a gigantic St. Paul, had become so concerned with their “salvation” that it decided to sacrifice most of its immense fortune to ensure the American masses’ “future.” To such purpose it was going to manufacture atomic weapons for the protection of American freedom.

The sum which the incomparable dinosaur was going to spend for the sake of its newly born love: one thousand two hundred and fifty million dollars.

True love has always scorned vile money. Small tokens, in

its eyes, can count more than all the riches of the earth. In exchange for the one-billion-dollar gift, all that the enamoured dinosaur longed for was a belated acknowledgment from its darling American people, plus the modest souvenir of . . . one hundred cents (to be paid by the American Government).

To avoid the danger of making the dinosaurian request sound greedy, perhaps it is wiser to simplify the monetary value of its demand. The enamoured dinosaur longed for, in addition to a belated recognition from the American people, the modest souvenir of one single American dollar . . . repeat, one single American dollar.

Pius XII's miracle of the zigzagging sun had been unmistakably dwarfed.

Miracles, whether concocted in Rome or in the U.S.A. however, when occurring do so to promote specific causes. That of the great dinosaur was meant to promote the building, controlling, and owning of the greatest atomic plant in the world (the Savannah River Plant) by that patriotic spender, the tyrannosaurian Du Pont.

That was not all. Behind the saintly Du Pont there stood whole hordes of no less patriotically unselfish and saintly American industrial and financial predatory monsters—Western Electric, Westinghouse, Monsanto, General Electric—flanked by other great reptiles, many of whom, during the Second World War, had consorted with America's main enemy, Hitler, and sabotaged the U.S.A.'s war effort. We have already seen how that was done, but to quote two additional examples: in April, 1941, Thurman Arnold, Congressional investigator, exposed a conspiracy between Nazi industrialists in Germany and the Aluminum Corporation of America, according to whom airplane production went up in Hitler's Germany and was kept down in England, France, and the U.S.A. In February, 1942, the Truman Senatorial Report named General Motors among the corporations which, for profit motives, had *wilfully sabotaged* the U.S.A. war effort for eighteen months.²⁵

To be sure, the U.S. Government was the official owner-controller of atomic energy . . . on paper. A surer fact, however, was that behind the governmental Atomic Energy Commission there stood, more powerful than ever, the *de facto*

owner-controllers: the giant corporations of America.²⁶ The A.E.C. was an enforced but welcome device adopted to hide this sinister reality with an official screen. But even the A.E.C. was controlled by the giant corporations. The official supreme atomic authority—namely, the Chairman of the Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy—at this period was Senator Brian McMahon, a Roman Catholic. The relationship between the big American dinosaurs and the American hierarchy, and hence between the Vatican and the invisible government of the U.S.A., being what it was, the significance of the *de facto* dinosaurian ownership of the atom, and of the control by Catholics of the official agency representing the American Administration, was a portent that should not escape any freedom-loving American.

The sundry Committees of Liberation, both in the U.S.A. and in Europe, prior to and after this period were, it must be remembered, inspired, financed, and directly promoted by the American owners of the atom.

The identification of interests of the invisible government of the U.S.A., placed in a position of secretly shaping the foreign policy of the country to run parallel with the interests of its ally, the Vatican—also secretly in the position of orientating the general policy of Europe—thus, in the long run, spelt the general orientation of the whole policy of the West since the end of the Second World War.

One of the most formidable secrets of Western politics lies precisely in such alliances. With such joint invisible Vatican-dinosaurian power functioning undetected in Europe and in the U.S.A., the various schemes of Central European liberations in the wake of a third World War could not be wholly dismissed as the pathetic dreams of frustrated Catholic statesmen, misguided nationalists, or genuine haters of tyranny, which many had identified with Communist nations. They were the political manifestations of the recondite, callous policy of two ruthless, rapacious Powers—the invisible government of the U.S.A. and the Vatican—which had set out to exploit Central European discontent and dreams so as to further their dinosaurian dominion.

The ultimate objective of such dominion was a simple one: the replacing of “Communist tyrannies,” not with genuine

democracies, but with "Catholic tyrannies," revolving simultaneously in the military, economic, and political orbits of the invisible government of the U.S.A., and in the religious, social, and ideological orbits of the Vatican. In other words, the replacement of the Kremlin with the Vatican's dominion, Pilsudski-type, throughout the vast region of Europe.

Such replacement, in Catholic calculations, will be accomplished via a third World War.

The First World War cost approximately £80,000,000,000. This sum would have been sufficient to buy up the whole of France and Belgium and everything they contained five times over. The Second World War's financial cost can best be judged by the following. The sums spent on it could have provided for *every family* in the U.S.A., Canada, Austria, Britain, Ireland, France, Germany, Soviet Russia, and Belgium a \$33,600 house, furniture worth \$11,200, and \$56,000 cash. In addition, every town with a population of over 200,000 could have been given a cash donation of \$70,000,000 for libraries, \$70,000,000 for schools, and \$70,000,000 for hospitals.

The third World War, even before its outbreak, has cost the European nations quasi-bankruptcy. Out of a total budget (1953) of 85 billion dollars, the U.S.A. alone appropriated the incredible sum of 65 billion dollars exclusively for military expenditure.²⁷

What was their cost in blood?

During the First World War, 10,000,000 people were killed outright, a further 10,000,000 died of epidemics, and 20,000,000 were wounded.²⁸

During the Second World War 20,000,000 men were killed in battle, 20,000,000 women, children, and old men were killed in air-raids; 29,500,000 were wounded, mutilated, or incapacitated; 21,250,000 were deported, interned, or otherwise made homeless; 30,000,000 homes were reduced to ashes; 150,000,000 people were left without shelter, prey to famine and disease.²⁹

The price of World War III will dwarf the prices paid for World Wars I and II. World War I was more destructive than the 901 major wars of the past 2,400 years; seven times more destructive than all of them combined. World War II was four times worse than World War I.

World War III will be a thousand times more destructive than World Wars I and II put together. Super atom bombs will wipe out whole towns. One single hydrogen bomb will kill 50,000,000 people, not in the space of one evening, but in the space of minutes.³⁰ World Wars I and II swept Europe and Asia; World War III will sweep also over the U.S.A. like the wrath of God. American cities will be destroyed, American women and children will be massacred by the million, whole nations will be wiped from the face of the earth.

Could the American people justify the waging of such a global massacre to replace "Red tyrannies" by Catholic tyrannies? Could the American people risk incineration to liberate the West from the "Red terror" in order to be threatened by the Catholic terror?

These are questions that all Americans must ask themselves in deadly earnest and then ponder over. For truly these are neither speculations nor mere hypotheses; they are sombre realities. America, the West, and the whole world are already revolving in their ever-growing spiral of destruction.

The Catholic Church has erected her tremendously malignant long-range policy upon it. Her "liberation" scheme for Eastern Europe and Soviet Russia, when translated into political parlance, means nothing less than its implementation. This is but one of her many concurrent policies. Her ultimate objective will be obtained by the implementation of the following interdependent Catholic schemes:

- (i) The erection of a vast conglomeration of Catholic dictatorships throughout Central Europe, where the Catholic Church would rule unchallenged.
- (ii) The fulfilment of the "promise" of Fatima—i.e. the "conversion" to the Catholic Church of a defeated Russia.
- (iii) The final "emergence" of the Catholic Church as the supreme religious-political arbiter of the West, and probably of the world, after the atomic destruction of the two mightiest rivals for global dominion, the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia, following a third World War.

Whether a globally maimed mankind would permit such

monstrous calculations to blossom into political realities is in the bosom of the future. Meanwhile, the hard, solid reality is that the grand policy of the Vatican is inspired precisely by such incredible designs. Such a policy has already been promoted, in practical, concrete terms, in Europe and elsewhere for years.

The tremendous hidden emotional-religious significance of the Fatima cult, with its cataclysmic phenomena epitomized in the Miracle of the Sun, is one of those undetected and yet real forces which are slowly but relentlessly conditioning a mass of 400,000,000 Catholics for the acceptance, and hence support, of whoever might fulfil the Fatima goal: the annihilation of Soviet Russia. Which means the conditioning of 400,000,000 Catholics, and of other hundreds of millions of their allies, by the Vatican and by certain forces in the U.S.A. for a third world massacre.

Vatican designs, conceived after the First World War, brought up to date during the Second, and promoted in the years that followed, have left their pattern upon Western political events ever since. Among these, those connected with Central Europe—as envisaged by Pilsudski, *Isthmus*, the European Movement, the Free Russia Committees, and similar bodies—have played a paramount role, almost out of proportion to their numerical importance.

The pattern of Vatican political machinations in that vast region, even when viewed with more cogent world problems, is anything but secondary. Its schemes are already part of the political history of the twentieth century. As such they should be carefully perused. For, besides proving how much the joint Vatican-American-dinosaurian exertions have up to now imperilled peace, they are a most astounding demonstration of how a Catholic domination would spell neither “liberation” nor, even less, the blossoming of true freedom.

A Catholic domination would spell a successful effort on the part of the Vatican to put back the clock of history, and, indeed, to enforce the deadly past upon a mankind already affrighted by so many tyrannies and, still more, by a future so pregnant with omens of oncoming calamities, the nefarious heritage of present global disasters, sired by the ever-mounting confusion of contemporary man.

THE SPECTACULAR CASE OF CARDINAL
MINDSZENTY, OR THE VATICAN'S
GREAT ATTEMPT TO PUT
BACK THE CLOCK

ONE DAY IN 1916, WHILE THE GUNS of the First World War were thundering in the bloody fields of Europe, a venerable old man died peacefully in his bed. He passed away, lamented by the Church, regretted by some friends, accursed by sullen multitudes and by millions of starry-eyed youths zealously slaying one another to usher in the century of the Common Man.

The old gentleman claimed 2,047 ancestors, of whom 1,486 were Germans, 124 French, 196 Italian, 89 Spanish, 52 Polish, 47 Danish, and 20 English. He had ruled a dominion comprising twenty different European races and countries from 1848 until 1916—a record. His name: Francis Joseph, Emperor of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. When that first global massacre ended and the living looked to the future, throbbing with hope, a revolution in Vienna swept away the Emperor's successor, Charles, and with him Francis's whole dynasty, the most Catholic House of Hapsburg.

Thirty years later, one day in 1946, Joseph Pehm, a man still in his prime, journeyed, tight-lipped, to Rome. The most he knew of his immediate lineage was that both his father and his mother were very poor peasants, as were their parents and their parents' parents, as far as the oldest inhabitant in his village could remember.

Once in the Eternal City the youngish-looking man was respectfully received by the Under-Secretary of State of the Vatican, and by none other than His Holiness the Pope, with whom he had very private meetings.

The following year he moved westward and landed in the U.S.A., where he was a personal guest of Cardinal Spellman. There he contacted important officials of the American State Department, an elderly lady, and her son. When back home Joseph Pehm thoughtfully drew up a list of names, carefully hid it among his most private papers; addressed cordial letters to the representatives of a hostile Power, venomous missives to his own government; smuggled foreign currency; held secret confabulations with shady personages; and, on the whole, carried out increasingly suspicious activities for a number of years. Result: Joseph Pehm was arrested, indicted, found guilty, and condemned to life-imprisonment. His brief U.S.A. encounters, it was found out, had been neither casual nor suave interchanges of cordialities. The lady proved to be none other than the ex-Empress Zita, widow of Charles; the son, Otto of Hapsburg, the claimant to the throne of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The list: a Ministerial selection for the future Catholic government of Hungary, charged with the task of a full-blooded restoration of the most Catholic Monarchy of the Hapsburgs to the Hungarian throne, following the violent overthrow of the Hungarian Government then in power. All this to be accomplished with the genteel co-operation of Hungarian Catholic insurgents, of the Vatican, and, last but not least, of the U.S.A.

Pehm's other name: Joseph Mindszenty, Cardinal Primate of Hungary.¹

The discovery of the plot caused a world sensation and was instantly labelled persecution of religion. Notwithstanding this, the true inspirers of it all were also brought before the court and indicted: the Vatican and the U.S.A. And the

trial, in spite of their frantic efforts to stultify it with a religious aura, turned into the most astounding up-to-date exposure of the vast Catholic political scheme, of whose outline we are cognizant.

This scheme's objective was the promotion of the grand strategy adopted concurrently by Rome and the invisible government of the U.S.A. in Eastern and Central Europe. Its implementation, it was soon realized, had been reckoned as important to the ultimate Vatican-American post-War goals as their scheme covering Western Europe was deemed necessary to the final success of their whole ideological strategy in relation to the entire West.

The Mindszenty failure had meant a serious set-back to such policies. Their sponsors, however, were soon able to profit by it, by skilfully turning their political misadventure to their advantage, via a tremendous mobilization of world public opinion, the ultimate objective of which was the simultaneous promotion of ideological odium and Catholic prestige on an unprecedented scale where it could be made to pay the biggest dividends—namely, in the U.S.A.

The twin Catholic-dinosaurian propaganda machines were swiftly made to pulsate with that specific object in view. Whereas the Vatican promptly transformed the whole issue into one of atheistic Communism versus innocent, pure, above-politics Catholicism, the dinosaurian Press, radio, and motion pictures of the U.S.A. depicted it as a monstrous violation of the sanctity of that personal freedom for which they, the great dinosaurs, had always longed to spill their—or, rather, the American and European peoples'—blood.

Except for a tiny minority, the American masses swallowed the Catholic-dinosaurian version, hook, line, and sinker, and clamoured that this poor, innocent Catholic priest, tortured and drugged by godless Reds, be set free.

It was another astounding demonstration that, although the American Press was the freest in the world, the American people were still "the most misinformed among enlightened nations," as their own Government had so sadly concluded only a few years before.²

The same phenomenon occurred in Europe and, in fact, everywhere, the Catholic-dinosaurian propaganda distortion

machinery having been mobilized simultaneously throughout the world.

Apart from a handful of trustworthy organs,³ the Western Press, with its 500,000,000 readers, indiscriminately accepted the Vatican-dinosaurian version of the affair. To the few impartial observers, and to the fewer of "those who knew" in the departments of State of the Vatican and of Washington, the truth was otherwise. Succinctly told, it was as follows.

.

Since 1870, with the collapse of Napoleon III, the Pope's paladin, the Catholic Church's secular sword in European politics had been inherited by a political hybrid: the Austro-Hungarian Empire. This was not only a political hybrid topped by an aloof tyrant who paled at the very word "democracy"; it was a most devoutly Catholic empire, ruled by the most traditionally bigoted of all European dynasties: the House of the Hapsburgs.

The Hapsburgs had sided with the Popes for almost a millennium, during which their zeal, instead of abating, increased. This being due, in addition to their hereditary obtuseness, to the fact that as the Hapsburg's collection of subjugated races augmented proportionately to their desire to unsaddle the oppressive Hapsburg protection, Mother Church's spiritual authority had proved to be increasingly useful when exercised in the right place and at the right moment to quell disorders; indeed, more than once to save that motley empire from disintegrating altogether.

The Hapsburg-Catholic political marriage, although a marriage of convenience consummated only after 1871, had its original roots in the wooing that had taken place, in an atmosphere charged with dreams of mutual Hapsburg, Catholic, Napoleonic grandeur, intrigue, and political melodrama, before Napoleon III's fall.

In that pre-marital period, Francis Joseph's brother, Maximilian, was dispatched to Mexico, under the joint Vatican-Napoleonic sponsorship, to set up nothing less than a Hapsburg Catholic American empire. Juarez, the Mexican Liberal leader who for years had been chased across Mexican territory by the armies of his Catholic opponents, saw to it (encouraged

by Lincoln) that no Vatican-Napoleonic-Hapsburg seedling was planted on American soil. Indeed, to the indescribable horror of the Pope, of his political carabinier Napoleon, not to speak of Catholic Europe, Juarez had Maximilian put before a Mexican execution squad.

After such a misadventure, the Hapsburg-Vatican ties became closer than ever, and were strengthened to such an extent that their joint ruthlessness outraged both Liberal and Conservative Europe. Whenever a province seethed with unrest, there the joint spiritual terrorization of Mother Church came invariably to supplement the most callous individual and mass hangings of patriots and liberals that the West had ever seen, in which gentle art the pious Hapsburgs had come to hold almost a monopoly.

The Hapsburg Empire not only gave stability to Catholic influence throughout its domains: it ensured it throughout European politics, the Empire, by the mere fact that it existed, being reckoned—as indeed it was—the most formidable stabilizer of Central Europe. And, as such, it was regarded as far more necessary to the Vatican than in its role of protector of the Church within its own imperial boundaries.

The reasons which had made of the Hapsburg colossus a keystone in the Vatican's grand European designs at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries can be broadly summarized thus:

- (a) It gave Catholicism unparalleled influence throughout a vastly populated, well-administered and highly centralized Empire, where Catholic power could be exercised over, not only devout and lukewarm members of the Church, but also Protestants and heretics—e.g. the Hussite Czechs and the Orthodox Serbs.
- (b) It was a most necessary factor on the great political chess-board of Europe, and enabled the Vatican to play its diplomatic game with great additional weight, strength, and prestige.
- (c) It was acting as the most powerful dyke: internally, against all forces of liberalism and democracy; externally, against those hostile to the Church—e.g. it prevented the waves of Russian Imperialism from lap-

ping too far westwards into Catholic Europe—Russian Imperialism at that period meaning, not so much territorial expansionism as religious penetration, the Czar being the official head of the Orthodox Church.

Thanks to these and other factors, therefore, the Austro-Hungarian dual Monarchy, more than useful, had become a necessity for the stability of a Europe dominated, as it was, by a few large political units jockeying for European hegemony. Its disappearance would have spelt disaster for all, especially for the Vatican.

Destiny had decided just that. And soon the folly of men and Papal vindictiveness helped its decree to be fulfilled.

In 1914 the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, a nephew of the Emperor Francis Joseph, went with his wife to visit a province of the Empire, predominantly Orthodox, bubbling with discontent. There, in Sarajevo, they were promptly assassinated. His Holiness Pope Pius X (since canonized), having, before the murder, stubbornly brooded over the desirability of punishing those "godless heretical Orthodox Serbs," seeing in the incident the hand of Divine Providence, promptly counselled the old Catholic Emperor to take drastic military measures against "Orthodox Serbia"—a counsel which Francis willingly followed.⁴

The spark which set Europe on fire had been lit. When the last gun echoed in the silent battlefields, the old Europe had gone. The Catholic Austro-Hungarian Empire and its pious Dynasty of the Hapsburgs were no more. In their stead—newly-born nations owing allegiance to none but themselves had sprung up overnight, where only a short while before there had stood that mighty bulwark of the Catholic Church, the Hapsburg Dynasty.

.

The disaster shook the Vatican, but not for long. Empires had tumbled and had risen before, the dawn and the twilight of many having been watched by successive Popes, who very often had charted their future with support or with enmity.

If the Popes had seen their birth and their fall, however, they had also seen that empires, although frequently made and

unmade by the sword, had at other times been created also by the manipulation of far-sighted diplomacy which, by consolidating their shaky structures or by rebuilding where it was necessary to rebuild, had slowed down their decline when they had not prevented them from tumbling to their destruction.

Vatican diplomacy, with its unmatched experience, consequently, as soon as the Hapsburg Empire fell, set out in earnest to do what it had attempted to do more than once in the past—namely, to lay down plans for its resurrection.

It was thus that, immediately following the War, while the strident voices of the peacemakers were echoing in spacious, treaty-littered halls, while the turmoiling little States had pugnaciously begun to tear one another's boundaries, while the new territory-swollen big nations, their visions obfuscated by acquisitional indigestion, were hypocritically talking of equality, and while the first potential European dictators were broodingly penning their manifestos, within the silent walls of the Vatican, men mindful of how empires are rebuilt set out calmly to re-erect the vanished, most Catholic Hapsburg Monarchy and its Austro-Hungarian Empire.

If the most Catholic dynasty of the Hapsburgs had, like an anchor, granted security to the barque of Peter in the perilous pre-War European political sea, that same anchor now had become a portentous necessity, transcending all that it had been in the past.

The face of the West had not only been altered; it had been disfigured. In Central Europe it had been maimed beyond recognition. There, where once the Catholic Church had ruled supreme, heretical States had impertinently come to the fore, challenging and disrespectful of the Church—e.g. Protestant Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia ruled by Orthodox Serbia. Worse still, the Russia of the Czars had become the Russia of Lenin. The Russia of Orthodoxy had become the Russia of the Bolsheviks, the terror of all God-fearing Christians. Particularly of those who, because of their genuine eagerness to ensure the spiritual treasures of the next world, clung so tentaciously to the material goods of this.

The reinstatement of the most Catholic House of Hapsburg having thus become the only guarantee for the salvation of Central Europe, the Vatican started to promote a policy

directed at retransforming that now politically, religiously, and ethnically jigsaw-puzzled region into an up-to-date, monolithic unit. This with the precise objective of making it play the same role in modern times as the old Empire had done in the days prior to the First World War.

To be sure, the new hybrid had to be apparelled in vestments acceptable to the changed political habitat. Steps in this direction were taken even before disaster overtook the Hapsburg fabric. As later, during the Second World War, the Vatican promoted a brand-new policy before the collapse of Fascist Europe, so also here it prosecuted a new plan prior to the collapse of the old Europe and the tumbling of the Hapsburg Dynasty.

In July, 1917, Charles, who on November 21, 1916, had succeeded his father, the Emperor Francis Joseph, as head of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, sent a "letter of filial obedience" to Pope Benedict XV, in which he left "to his august authority" the decision of the sacrifices which the Austro-Hungarian Empire had to make to obtain a quick peace.* The peace was meant to save the Catholic Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, not so much from being defeated as from being disintegrated.

The efforts of the Vatican for a separate Austro-Hungarian peace with the Allies failed. Germany and Austria-Hungary were defeated. In 1918 the Dynasty of the Hapsburgs was swept away by the people. On November 10 Charles knelt before the altar of the royal chapel of Schönbrunn and made a solemn vow: "I shall never abdicate," he said, with streaming tears. "After me there will be Otto, and after my family is no more there will still be some Hapsburg who will succeed us." Charles, his wife Zita, and their five children, the oldest of whom was named Otto, were outlawed by a decree of Karl Renner, first President of the new Austrian Republic. Charles took refuge in Switzerland, where he began to plan for the reconquest of his throne.

In Hungary, powerful forces rallied immediately to his cause. These were composed mostly of staunch Catholics, big landowners, the greatest bulk of whom belonged to the Hungarian nobility. Nine hundred and eighty of such gentry owned a third of the whole Hungarian territory, and 1,112 of

them owned a sixth of the whole cultivable land of that country. The unconcern of these individuals with the welfare of their people had become proverbial throughout Europe, as were their extravagances—typified, for instance, by an Esterhazy, who boasted that he used one of Titian's paintings as a portmanteau, or by a member of the Karoly family, who once hired a whole train to send a bottle of Tokay to a *dame de cœur*.

Charles invaded Hungary at the head of such a patriotic motley and tried twice to reconquer the Hungarian crown by force of arms. He failed by a hair's-breadth, once reaching the very gates of Budapest. In sight of the capital Charles lost, in October, 1921. The man who defeated him: Micklos Horthy. Horthy ordered the arrest of numerous Royalists, many of whom were also members of Parliament. On November 8, 1921, the majority of the Assembly voted in favour of the Act of Dethronement, which Horthy, as Regent of Hungary, ratified. Charles's wife, Zita, was made a prisoner with her husband, and, with their children, they were handed over to the Allies. The Allies, including the U.S.A., promptly deported them to the island of Madeira, to prevent more attempts at a Hapsburg restoration.

In Hungary, however, monarchical and Catholic elements went on plotting. Their efforts were not a success; but they were not a total failure either. For Hungary, although deprived of the Monarchy, never became a republic like Austria. It was turned into a Regency, in which dubious status it remained from 1919 to 1944—i.e. throughout the dictatorship of Admiral Horthy.

During that period various attempts at a Hapsburg restoration were made, particularly in Austria, after that Republic fell into the hands of a faithful creature of the Vatican—a priest, Mgr. Seipel, whose judgment on political matters was considered so valuable that he often advised the Pope himself. Seipel's basic idea was no less than the restoration of the Hapsburg Monarchy in all those countries which had constituted the Hapsburg Empire before its downfall, but under an up-to-date political structure.

The scheme was not an original one. Seipel had borrowed it from Charles of Hapsburg, who, in 1918, as the Catholic

Emperor of Austria and the Apostolic King of Hungary, had declared that he was disposed to transform the Dual Monarchy into a confederation of independent States: a scheme, this, Vatican-inspired, which the Allies—Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Woodrow Wilson—promptly rejected.

The rebirth of the Catholic Hapsburg Empire, or, rather, the up-to-date version of the Charles-Vatican plan of 1918, according to Seipel, was to take place in stages.

It would have started as a political association of former Hapsburg countries, a kind of federation of Catholic States. Its completion would have begun with the gradual building of a Danubian Confederation, by consolidating a series of political and economic agreements welding together Central Europe, to be followed by a policy directed at the disintegration of the various countries concerned. Austria would have served as their nucleus. From the surrounding countries Seipel proposed to take: from Yugoslavia, a third of her territory, i.e. Catholic Croatia; from Czechoslovakia, also a third of her territory, i.e. Catholic Slovakia.

Hungary, of course, would have come second to Austria. That was not all. Seipel had added a morsel or two of his own to Charles's scheme. All being well, Catholic Bavaria, which France was then trying to separate from Berlin, and Alsace-Lorraine would have been included. Result: more than a Catholic federation, Seipel's scheme would have become a Papal federation, where the Pope would be the head, or at least the *de facto* ruler, prior to and after the reinstatement of the Monarchy.

Seipel had already designated the future most Catholic Emperor: Otto, the son of the former Empress Zita, who, he saw to it, was trained at the Benedictine Abbey of St. Maurice, in Clervaux, Luxembourg. Seipel and Zita decided that Otto, the better to fulfil his task as a future ruler of several races, must learn the languages of the nations he was going to rule—i.e. German, Hungarian, Croat, Czech, and Slovak. Notwithstanding the fact that he was a private citizen, everyone had to address him as "Your Majesty," while the etiquette of a vanished Court had to be strictly observed in his presence. These were not merely a prelate's or a woman's idiosyncrasies: they were the coldly calculated actions of people who knew

how powerful forces were working for the re-establishment of the Hapsburg Monarchy.

At the age of eighteen Otto was proclaimed the legal pretender to the Imperial throne of Austria, in addition to the kingdoms of Hungary, Bohemia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Slovenia, Galicia, Illyria, and other places.

In the eyes of the Vatican Otto had legal claims which justified his and any of his supporters' exertions for his restoration in those lands. Backed by Royalist supporters in Austria and Hungary, Otto from then onward began to come openly to the fore, advocating the restoration of the Hapsburg Monarchy and taking an active part in the politics of those countries before the Second World War.

Prior to the Vatican's sudden support of the Anschluss (1937-8), Otto had publicly demanded a restoration of the Hapsburgs in Austria. "The time for taking a decisive action has come," he said. "I am ready to enter the country at any moment . . ." (June, 1936). At this period, Otto had the support of both Mussolini and Pius XI, both of whom, to strengthen Otto's political position, had arranged for his engagement to Princess Mafalda, daughter of the King of Italy.

In March, 1938, the *coup d'état* foretold by Otto's supporters took place. But the new master of Austria, instead of Otto, the scion of the Hapsburg Dynasty, was a former private soldier of the Emperor Francis Joseph's grand armies: one Adolf Hitler, the newly-elected Chancellor of Nazi Germany.

.

The rise of Hitler had shattered the hopes of the Hapsburgs in Austria, in Slovakia, in Croatia, and, finally, in Hungary when that country joined the Axis. For a time the Vatican shelved the project. It could do nothing else. Hitler was fulfilling the grand role of any potential Hapsburg monarch by making Central Europe a formidable bulwark against Communist Russia. Hence Papal co-operation with Hitler in the latter's incorporation of Austria, disintegration of Czechoslovakia prior to the Second World War, and dismemberment of Yugoslavia, incorporation of Orthodox Serbia, and creation of the "independent" Catholic State of Croatia during the

War. As long as that policy was successful the Hapsburg question had to, and did, remain in the background. Once the Nazi edifice began to crack, however, the Hapsburg question was revived in earnest and soon became again the foundation stone of Vatican Central European post-War diplomacy.

The Catholic strategists had by no means been caught unawares. For, while Hitler was careering in his mad ascent to power, they had quietly been grooming a half-forgotten Otto, in case Hitler's fortunes should change; as, in fact, they did.

Otto was made to peregrinate in various countries, where Catholic forces promoted him as a private individual "with great future political potentialities." Prior to the Second World War he was permitted to enter France, where he was given semi-official support. Having made important contacts there, Otto was dispatched to the country which, in the Vatican's reckoning, might play the leading role in a future Hapsburg restoration—the U.S.A. The U.S.A. was a Republic and a Protestant land. But the Vatican, when planning international politics, not only does not even deign to consider such characteristics; it wholly disregards the reaction of the American people, for whom it entertains the greatest scorn.

Otto was made to contact, not so much the American people, as their American masters. Objections to his entry were brushed aside, thanks to a joint French-American Catholic sponsorship, and the Hapsburg's scion visited the U.S.A. under the name of Otto de Bar. There Otto was received as a "very important person," became the protégé of Cardinal Spellman, was received by President Roosevelt, and, last but not least, had discussions with the leading political, financial, and industrial members of the invisible government of the U.S.A., headed by none other than J. Pierpont Morgan, the great financier, who was quickly won over to a potential Hapsburg restoration.

When Fascist Europe collapsed and Communism rushed in to fill the void, the invisible government of the U.S.A. adopted the Vatican's policy of prompt restoration of the Hapsburg Monarchy as a foundation stone of the joint Vatican-American fight against Soviet Russia.

From then onward the Hapsburg question assumed an ever-more-urgent significance. The U.S.A., having embarked upon

it, set to work on its implementation. This implied a partial and also a total restoration of the former Hapsburg dominion which had once comprised most of Central Europe.

To re-erect such a vast edifice the first step was to reinstate the Hapsburgs in one country—either Austria or Hungary—and then to bring together the surrounding States. The first stage would take the form of a democratic federation of the various countries of Central Europe, with a Federal Constitution modelled upon that of the U.S.A. Otto would become the Federal President, unless he had restored the Monarchy in any given country before that stage was achieved.

The land in which Otto would begin to rule, either as President, Regent, Constitutional Monarch, or the like, was not difficult to find. Austria, being partly occupied by the Soviet Army, was excluded. Slovakia was too small. Croatia was dismissed owing to the establishment of Tito's Communist Dictatorship. In Hungary conditions were more favourable. There existed a democratic government, influential monarchist elements, and a Cardinal Primate who was still legally vested with feudal privileges—that is to say, who could *legally* become head of the State. This, thanks to the fact that the Primate, who had always been appointed directly by the Vatican, had from medieval times crowned the Hungarian kings as the representatives of the Pope. Because of this, throughout the centuries he had been invested with the second highest office in the land—that is, he was considered second only to the king himself. Another proof that the Papal claims to earthly powers, as seen at the beginning of this book, were not mere symbols, but concrete, real claims, still capable of serious repercussions in this our twentieth century. The privileges that such a function imported were never legally abolished; Admiral Horthy, during his semi-Fascist dictatorship, having continued to invest the Primacy with its feudal status.

Owing to the exalted position of the Primate, to the influence of the Catholic hierarchy, and to the vast economic wealth of the Church, the head of Hungarian Catholicism by wielding enormous power was the natural leader of any movement directed at the restoration of a Catholic monarchy in that country.

With the ending of the Second World War, consequently, Hungary, lying as she does between Soviet Russia and Western Europe, became suddenly paramount in the anti-Russian ideological and military strategy of America and of the Vatican, which set out in dead earnest to implement the first part of their joint policy.

This was simplicity itself: the monarchist elements were to rally round the Cardinal Primate. The Primate, using his religious and political influence, would, with outside help, promote an internal crisis, with the object of causing the downfall of the Government. That would give the Cardinal a golden opportunity to exercise his legal privilege and thus take up the reins of power. The second step, the restoration of the Hapsburg Monarchy, would follow.

The death of the Hungarian Primate, Cardinal Seredi, could not have been more timely, as it enabled the Vatican to select, at the right moment, the very man it had judged most fit for the task. In 1945 an obscure clergyman was nominated Cardinal Primate. His name: Joseph Pehm, born in Mindszent, and later known as Joseph Mindszenty. Mindszenty's nomination rested mainly upon two main qualifications: his exceptional devotion to Rome and his exceptional attachment to the Monarchy. His attachment to the House of Hapsburg can be judged by the fact that, when still a young priest, he had joined the legitimist movement as early as 1921 (the Emperor Charles died in 1922), and that in 1924 in his zeal for their cause he went so far as to visit the exiled Hapsburgs, screening the visit, even then, with the excuse of religion—i.e. a devotional pilgrimage to the shrine of Lourdes.

These facts, of an exceptional political nature, were duly noted by an exceptionally politically-minded Pope like Pius XII, who needed precisely such a man to carry out such an exceptionally important political undertaking. Mindszenty was given, not only a cardinal's hat, but simultaneously specific political instructions and money (30,000 dollars) as a first "extraordinary" monetary fund to start his activities, given to him before his departure by the Vatican's Under-Secretary of State, Mgr. Montini.

Mindszenty—narrow-minded, stubborn, and fanatical—who had taken his mission as a priest very seriously, now, as a

cardinal entrusted with so important a task, took himself in deadly earnest. On his return from Rome he conducted himself as if no changes whatsoever had occurred since the end of Horthy's dictatorship. Mindszenty acted, not only as the supreme head of the Hungarian Church, but also as the political head of a State who was being ostracized by a usurping government which refused to recognize the real status of the Primate. Acting upon such a presumption, Mindszenty launched an undeclared war against the government and mobilized the whole machinery of the Hungarian Church.

He bitterly opposed all kinds of reforms, particularly those connected with the land and with schools. We have already seen the nature of some of them. Before the War, 4,500,000 of Hungary's 9,000,000 population were peasants. Of these, 3,000,000 formed what were called the landless "three million beggars." Redistribution of the land had been promised by all political parties during the previous thirty years, without anything having been done about it. After the Second World War the new Hungarian Government took the matter in hand. One-third of the agricultural land was given to 642,000 peasant families, most of them previously landless or owners of tiny plots. Owners of less than 1,400 acres were allowed to retain up to 140 acres for their own use—which was not unfair, when it is remembered that the average given to each peasant family was only seven and a half acres. The land reform had stripped the Church of many rich acres, the Church being the biggest landowner in the country. The Government, however, maintaining a fairness worthy of admiration, allowed every See to retain up to 300 acres, and every parish church up to fifteen acres.

Mindszenty fought such redistribution with all his power, and equally directed his zeal to the field of education, where religious—that is to say, Catholic—teaching, until then compulsory, was made an alternative subject.

The Protestant Churches welcomed the changes, but not Mindszenty, who opposed them all by writing hostile pastoral letters, which he commanded should be read in all churches, going so far as to threaten with excommunication any Catholic, or Catholic teacher, approving of the reforms. This, it should be noticed, in spite of the fact that that Government, in those

same years, had reconstructed 570 war-damaged churches and had given generous State grants to all religious communities: e.g. in 1950, 78,000,000 forints, of which about two-thirds went to the Catholic Church.

In 1946 Mindszenty went again to Rome. After prolonged consultations with the Vatican Under-Secretary of State, Montini, and the Pope, he returned home with fresh instructions, plus 10,000 dollars.

In that same year the Hungarian Republic was formally established. Mindszenty defiantly refused to recognize the fact and returned unopened all letters sent to him by the President, the head of the Hungarian Government. Simultaneously, following the fresh instructions from Rome, he began in earnest his political activities, with the object of mobilizing forces ready to work for the overthrow of the Republic and the establishment of the Monarchy.

Mindszenty began his new campaign by sending a letter to the President, M. Tildy, protesting against the establishment of the Republic's Constitution. At the same time he began to promote, with the utmost vigour, secret activities which ranged from the co-ordination of the illegal Monarchist organizations at home to the renewal of contacts abroad with Hungarian Royalists in exile, via the American Legation in Budapest, and with various cardinals, among them the Belgian Primate, Van Roey, and Cardinal Spellman in New York.

In the following year, 1947, the synchronization of the war against the Hungarian Government and the intrigues connected with the installation of the Monarchy gathered momentum.

To strengthen both, Mindszenty set in operation the whole machinery of the Hungarian Church, to such an extent that at the conference of Hungarian bishops that year he drafted their pastoral letters, ordering them to have them read in all churches, with the specific purpose of influencing adversely the general elections, which were due in that same year, thereby undermining the Government.

While engaged in all such exertions at home, Mindszenty was no less active with his many supporters abroad, whom he kept well informed about the progress being made for the promotion of the "cause." Some of these were certain American authorities specially briefed by both the State Depart-

ment and the American Intelligence, with whom Cardinal Spellman was co-operating.

Mindszenty prepared a memorandum in which he informed them of his plans regarding his approaching seizure of power. Not content with this, he went so far as to work out a detailed scheme, to be operated immediately the Republic was overthrown. A good part of it consisted of a statement, to be delivered to the nation, meant to prove that he, Cardinal Mindszenty, in view of the claims of which we have spoken before, was entitled by right to become the head of the Hungarian State during the period between the overthrow of the Republic and the enthronement of a Hungarian king. Mindszenty, the better to substantiate such a prerogative, charged Professor Miklos Gruber with preparing a study, with a view to proving that, in earlier history, the Prince Primate had taken over power in similar circumstances. Mindszenty had become so sure of the imminence of the need for this declaration that he ordered the paper for it from the printing works of Stephaneums. This was not all. He drew up nothing less than a list of the future Cabinet, with himself as Regent (autumn, 1947).

His optimism was not mere wishful thinking. It was based upon the belief that the U.S.A. was coming to his help. And that such help would come that same year (1947), when "an historic change might come about," to use his own words. Mindszenty's assumption had been fed by reports from the Vatican, which, in turn, depended upon the information on what was secretly brewing in some quarters in the U.S.A., sent by Cardinal Spellman, the link with the political "creatures" of the invisible government of the U.S.A. We have already seen what James Forrestal and other no less illustrious personages were doing in that year, both in the East and in the West. With regard to the Hungarian case, Spellman had informed Mindszenty that political and military authorities in America were already talking about a push to the Danube. A push to the Danube meant one thing: a third World War. The whole plan was based upon this, as, without external armed intervention, the overthrow of the Hungarian Government by Mindszenty and his associates could not seriously be visualized.

Prior to and during this period, however, the power of the invisible government of the U.S.A. had not yet penetrated deep enough into the legal American Government and American State Department. The result was that a good number of American officials, having not yet been contaminated by the billionaire corporations-Catholic bacilli, were still devoted to the principles of American democracy and decency of international relations with foreign States. The consequences of this state of affairs were seen at work in the case of Hungary. There, Cardinal Mindszenty, acting on the advice of Spellman, repeatedly contacted the American authorities in Hungary, with a view to enlisting their support for his cause. Spellman, like Mindszenty, had taken it for granted that the American authorities there had been duly "briefed" by those in the plot in Washington about the support they were expected to give to Mindszenty's plans. That this was by no means the case soon became obvious to both Mindszenty and Spellman. For some time Mindszenty had been writing letters to the U.S. Minister in Budapest, asking for American help. In one of these Mindszenty warned the American Minister that "intervention is already desperately urgent" (December 16, 1946), while in another he openly requested the U.S.A. to help him to overthrow the Hungarian Government. "I ask the help of the U.S.A. Settlement of the crisis is possible with outside help. *I shall show the way how.*" To Mindszenty's chagrin and astonishment, the American Minister not only failed to help, he refused to co-operate in the overthrow of the Hungarian Government. The relevant text of his reply to Mindszenty read as follows :

LEGATION OF THE U.S.A.,

BUDAPEST, *December 27, 1946.*

YOUR EMINENCE :

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letters of November 22, of December 12, and of December 16, containing observations on general matters of political interest in Hungary at the present time.

Copies of your letters have been forwarded to the Department of State.

It is noted that your letters of December 12 and December 16, touching on internal political problems in Hungary, *requested the assistance of the United States Government* in altering certain conditions which your Eminence deplors. In this connexion you are, of course, aware of my Government's long-standing policy of *non-interference in the internal*

affairs of other nations. This policy has proven . . . through many trying situations the best guarantee of spontaneous, genuine democratic government. It will be clear to your Eminence that it necessarily precludes action by this Legation which could properly be construed as interference in Hungarian domestic affairs or that which lies outside the normal functions of diplomatic missions.

I take the opportunity, etc. . . .

Signed, H. F. ARTHUR SCHOENFELL,
American Minister.

Far from being discouraged, Mindszenty wrote another letter (January 3, 1947), in which he again renewed his request that the American envoy interfere in the internal policy of Hungary on his behalf. That was not all. Mindszenty wrote a letter to none other than President Truman, asking him to put an end to the Hungarian Republic by military intervention (letter dated June 12, 1947).

Nor was this enough. Mindszenty resolved to travel in person to the U.S.A., and, under the pretext of attending a religious congress of the Virgin Mary at Ottawa, he went first to Canada and then to the United States. The journey had a definite, concrete purpose: to plead the case for American intervention where persuasion was most needed; to contact the potential King of Hungary and powerful Royalist plotters; and to decide with sundry "creatures" of the invisible government of the U.S.A., posted in the State Department, what practical steps to take for bringing about the downfall of the Republic and the restoration of the Monarchy.

In the U.S.A. Mindszenty was guest of the American "Grey Eminence," Cardinal Spellman. There he made the personal acquaintance of various old Monarchist plotters, reputedly now in the pay of the American State Department—e.g. Tibor Eckhardt, well known as a conspirator and as an ardent Monarchist ringleader as far back as 1920. More important still, Mindszenty met ex-Empress Zita. The meeting took place, with ominous secrecy, in a convent in Ottawa, and was arranged through the good offices of the Father Confessor to the former Royal Family, Father Zsamboki. Last but not least, Mindszenty met Otto, the potential King of Hungary. The two convened, it should be noted, again in a convent, this time in Chicago.

Otto, Zita, the two cardinals, Spellman and Mindszenty, and

others, worked out detailed plans, to be put into execution in the near future. These were all based upon the assumption that the U.S.A. would intervene at the right moment. Spellman and Otto assured Mindszenty that U.S. help was almost a certainty. Too many of their powerful friends in the States were interested in the "cause" to permit them to entertain any more doubts about which direction the State Department would soon take.

Emboldened by this, Mindszenty, to strengthen Otto's political weight in the U.S.A., authorized Otto to represent Catholic Hungarians in America. This, it must be remembered, while the legal Hungarian Government was represented by a Hungarian Minister in Washington.

Steps were also taken to co-ordinate Hungarian-American political exertions in the U.S.A. and to raise monetary funds. Last but not least, Spellman informed Mindszenty that the American Minister in Budapest was to be replaced by one who would "co-operate." Mindszenty had better meet the new Minister before leaving the States was the Grey Eminence's advice.

Once back in Hungary Mindszenty, fired by his U.S. visit, redoubled his activities. The Legitimist Organization was officially founded. Catholic Action was charged with conducting eminently political activities behind the cloak of religion; two of its leaders—Brother Bela Ispanky, Catholic Action secretary and one of Mindszenty's closest associates, and Prince Paul Esterhazy, one of the richest men in Hungary—representing the Monarchists.

Not content with this, Mindszenty formed his own revolutionary staff and engaged additional plotters: Joseph Cziraki, Justin Baranyay, and others. By this time he had become so sure of success that he even reshuffled his own list of the future government, in readiness for "taking over power" as Regent.

Once again such optimism was caused, not only by Cardinal Spellman's exertions—whose pressure on the State Department had caused the removal of Arthur Schoenfell, the "unco-operative" American Minister in Hungary—but also by the fact that Spellman had swayed to his side no other than Kenneth C. Royall, the American Under-Secretary of War, who became personally a staunch supporter of the Hungarian plot.

James Forrestal, although never prominent in all this, was also unofficially behind it and gave powerful assistance.

The enterprise by now had reached such a stage that both the Vatican and the American State Department began to deal with it in a semi-official way. Mgr. Montini, Vatican Under-Secretary of State, in fact, had started to correspond on the matter directly with both Mindszenty and the American State Department.

With the U.S.A. and the Vatican now directly supporting the enterprise, Mindszenty's activities became wider in scope, and some of his colleagues abroad—e.g. Archbishop Rohracher, of Salzburg, Cardinal Faulhaber, of Munich (who were in direct correspondence with Spellman), Cardinal Innitzer, of Vienna, who wrote personally to the Pope, and Cardinal Van Roey, of Belgium—came to the fore, as did also, strangely enough, another no-less-illustrious person: Micklos Horthy, the former Fascist Dictator of Hungary.

Horthy, who two decades earlier had prevented the Hapsburgs from sitting on the Hungarian throne, now sided with Mindszenty, Innitzer, Faulhaber, and the Vatican for the restoration of the Monarchy. This strange bedfellowship had been promoted by a common cause: their hatred for the Hungarian Red Government.

Headed by Mindszenty, the cardinals and the former Dictator had set themselves a task upon which could depend the very restoration of the Monarchy. This consisted in preventing the royal crown from being returned to Hungary. The Hungarian Holy Crown was not merely a coronation jewel, it had an independent legal role. For centuries verdicts of the Court had been announced in its name. The object, in fact, embodied both State power and Hungarian sovereignty. Its possessor could consider himself a legal pretender to the throne of Hungary. The doctrine of the Holy Crown was accepted in its entirety by Cardinal Mindszenty, who, consequently, needed to have it in his own hands. It became, therefore, imperative that the crown should not fall into the possession of the Hungarian Government, lest, by withholding its use, it prevent Mindszenty from legally enthroning Otto as King of Hungary. The crown had been taken by the Hungarian Fascist Arrow Cross into Germany for safe keeping. In 1945

it fell into the hands of the American military authorities, who at that period were still holding it.

Mindszenty asked the U.S.A. not to hand the crown to the Hungarian Government, which, since the end of the Second World War, had repeatedly requested its return, not on account of its doctrine, but on the grounds that it was a Hungarian historical relic. Cardinals Innitzer and Faulhaber were approached with a view to having both exert pressure upon the American authorities in occupation of the territory where the crown was kept.

Mindszenty's idea was a simple one. The crown would be sent, not to Budapest, but to Rome. To this effect, the Cardinal wrote to Mr. Selden Chapin, the new "co-operative" U.S. Minister to Hungary:

My request to you is to obtain an order from your Government, effecting the transportation of the Crown by the Army and its transfer to the same Apostolic Power, his Holiness the Pope, whose predecessor presented St. Stephen with the Holy Crown in the year of 1000 A.D. Since this cause of the Crown is a very important one for our nation, and since demands for its return and military advances might be fatal for the Crown, only Rome could reassure us. (*August 31, 1947.*)

The pressure brought by Cardinal Spellman upon certain quarters of the State Department had worked as planned, and the Under-Secretary of State of the Vatican hastened to inform Mindszenty of the matter:

September 9, 1947.

YOUR EMINENCE:

The representative of the Vatican in the United States of America forwarded to me the copy of the letter given by Kenneth C. Royall [American Under-Secretary of War] to Cardinal Spellman. The letter concerns the Hungarian Holy Crown. I take the liberty to send it to you, as I know its subject is close to your heart.

Signed, J. B. MONTINI.

Mindszenty approached the ex-Dictator Horthy. And the man who had defeated the Hapsburgs in 1921 now, ironically enough, became a monarchical paladin. Horthy wrote to no less a personage than the Pope himself, requesting him to take the crown into his custody:

WEILHEIM, April 3, 1948.

HOLY FATHER:

. . . It gives me infinite pleasure to inform you that the Americans will

hand over our Holy Crown, along with the coronation emblems, to the Apostolic Chair. . . . I would be infinitely grateful if Colonel Pajtás, Commander of the Crown's Guard, would be allowed to remain in Rome. . . .

Thank God, the mood of both the Americans and other nations has completely changed towards us, and we have every reason to believe *that our status will soon be settled.*

Signed, MICKLOS HORTHY.

Simultaneously, Mindszenty continued his exertions against the Hungarian Government. The U.S.A.'s long-standing policy of "non-intervention in the internal affairs of other nations," as expounded by A. Schoenfell before his removal, by now had become a basic, urgent policy of direct intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary. Schoenfell's successor, Mr. Chapin, saw to it that this new American policy was pursued to the letter. The extent of this can be judged by the fact that Chapin had a say in the drafting of Mindszenty's pastoral letters, as a means of creating opposition to the Hungarian Government.

Since the arrival of Chapin, these letters increased in venom and violence to such a degree that he, considering them the most effective vehicle for the direct promotion of popular resistance, declared: "It is absolutely necessary to continue issuing pastoral letters of this tone."

The Mindszenty-Chapin co-operation having reached such a stage, it followed that American-Catholic exertions in various fields were also co-ordinated, and real Intelligence work was promptly initiated. This Mindszenty undertook after a meeting in January, 1948, with Mr. Chapin, as did also Dr. Micklos Nagy, Secretary of Catholic Action, and Prelate Zsigmond Mihailovics, who placed funds at the disposal of the Catholic Caritas Institute, to run an Intelligence service under the control of the cardinal.

We have already described in a previous chapter how Vatican Intelligence is conducted mainly via the machinery of the Catholic Church, through which a reliable collection of data, which can range from a purely religious or cultural to a purely political and even military nature, is undertaken, whenever necessary. Mindszenty followed the orthodox pattern, and passed collected information to Chapin, who, naturally, transmitted it to the U.S.A. This, it must be noted, was

collected from the routine reports of bishops and priests, but also by clergy specially engaged on such work—e.g. Father Spanky, who was wont to meet an Intelligence agent in a Franciscan monastery in Budapest. Most of it consisted of local information about the nature, size, and movements of military forces, their supplies and even military budgets.

Such activities required money. Money came from the U.S.A. The principal donors: American-Hungarian Catholics, Otto's friends, the State Department, and Cardinal Spellman. Mindszenty himself in 1947 brought back from the U.S.A. \$30,000, which he failed to declare. This failure was not exceptional; illegal financial deals had become a regular feature, owing mainly to the necessity of avoiding disclosing to the Government the large sums that had been acquired and spent—e.g. the cheques for about \$29,000 which Prince Paul Esterhazy brought for Cardinal Mindszenty, backed by Cardinal Spellman. Within a few years, the total of such illegal transactions amounted to \$141,000, plus 15,000 Swiss francs, of which Mindszenty declared only \$4,800.

Until this time, except for official and private warnings, the Government had refrained from taking any drastic measures against Mindszenty. The Government's main reason: avoidance of an official arrest and trial, which, it knew, would promptly be transformed by the Vatican from a purely political affair into a religious question. At this stage, however, Mindszenty's activities having gone as far as they had done, the Government began to consider taking drastic measures.

Mindszenty got wind of what was coming. Documents were hidden—e.g. those referring to the names and activities of the illegal organizations and giving details of the future provisional government, to be headed by Mindszenty. Most of these were, in November, 1948, buried in a metal container in the cellar of the archiepiscopal palace of Esztergom. Some of Mindszenty's associates fled abroad. Finally the Government, in self-protection, had the Cardinal arrested.

After his arrest Mindszenty wrote a letter, which he managed secretly to send, to whom? To the Hungarian faithful, asking for their prayers? Mindszenty believed in something more concrete than his flock's prayers. He had implicit faith in his greatest supporter, the U.S.A.

The letter, in his own handwriting, was addressed to the American Minister. Its contents are more than illuminating:

MR. MINISTER:

Action has to be taken before Thursday. The trial is ready, and is pointed *against America*. They want to prove I received money from America for secrets. I ask for a car and a plane. Warmest regards.

Signed, MINDSZENTY,

January 28, 1949.

P.S. I ask Koczak to arrange immediately that he should meet the bearer of this letter today, in order to discuss everything. Promise 4,000 dollars to the pilot in the interest of the case, which I will repay later.

Signed, MINDSZENTY.

The trial of Mindszenty opened in Budapest on February 3, 1949, before the Special Senate of the Budapest People's Court and the representatives of the world Press. Charged with treason, conspiracy to overthrow the Republic, and with infringing the currency law, Mindszenty was sentenced to life-imprisonment.

A cry of horror echoed round the world. Pro-Mindszenty demonstrations took place in Europe and in the Americas. For months the case of Mindszenty was kept under the eyes of an indignant global public opinion as one of the most villainous examples of the Communists' diabolical hatred against religion. Foreign Offices and statesmen who should have known better protested against this blatant persecution of Christianity. The British Foreign Secretary, President Truman, the French Foreign Minister, the Belgian Prime Minister, the Australian Foreign Minister—indeed, the very United Nations Organization—lodged protests against the Hungarian Government. Except for a small number of papers, the whole American Press wilfully misrepresented the whole issue. It was one of the worst examples of an organized Press and radio campaign, slanted reporting, and plain distortion and falsification of facts, promoted with the precise object of misinforming and deceiving the people of a whole continent.

The degree of such dinosaurian-Catholic mass-lying can be gauged by the fact that many Protestant Churches joined the Vatican in promoting the legend of religious persecution.

This agitation and falsification, while to a great extent caused by ignorance, was the product of plain malice in certain responsible American quarters. Had they genuinely wished

to bring home the true character of the Mindszenty case, they could have done so most efficaciously simply by shifting the case to the U.S.A. Supposing that the Archbishop of New York, Cardinal Spellman, had for years been plotting for the forcible overthrow of the U.S. Government and the abolition of the American Constitution, with the specific view of restoring the English monarchy in the U.S.A., on the grounds that the U.S.A. in the eyes of the Church was still an English colony and, consequently, had no right to set up a government not headed by the English sovereign. Supposing, furthermore, that, to carry out this plan, he had asked the direct military intervention of a great foreign Power; had drawn up a list of the future government, headed by himself, the better to prepare for an English monarch to take over Washington. Also that, to achieve this, he had organized an underground movement throughout the States in readiness for a general uprising the moment a foreign army set foot on American soil. Supposing that irrefutable documents had proved all this, and that the U.S.A., after a fair trial, had condemned Cardinal Spellman to life-imprisonment. Could the American people then accuse the American Administration of religious persecution?

Yet the chief inspirer of all Mindszenty's political activities, Pius XII, had no hesitation in using his religious authority to stultify the whole issue. Soon after the trial, addressing a huge crowd in St. Peter's Square, he said :

The sentence which has been inflicted . . . upon an eminent Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, on the banks of the Danube, has aroused on the banks of the Tiber a cry of indignation worthy of the eternal city.

The Church does not meddle in purely political and economic questions, nor does she care to discuss the good or evil of one or the other particular form of government. . . . [Yet] a regime hostile to religion has struck at a Prince of the Church. . . . Can the Pope keep silent, when the point is reached of punishing with imprisonment a priest guilty of refusing to violate the most sacred and inviolate of secrets, the secret of the confessional . . . ? [*sic*] Is all this, perhaps, unwarranted interference in the political power of the State? Who could honestly say, yes? ⁵

A sad blow to those few honest Catholics who look to the Pope as the inspired mouthpiece of truth, but a further confirmation to the impartial student of Vatican diplomacy that

the Pope is nothing but an unscrupulous political intriguer, ready to betray, deceive, and lead his own followers astray to assuage his ever-insatiable lust for political glory and political power.

The scope of the Mindszenty plot assumes a wider significance if viewed as a broad European problem. For its ultimate objective was the imposition of the Catholic-Hapsburg rule upon, not one, but a whole family of nations. If implemented, consequently, it would have affected the political balance of the whole continent. Indeed, by causing a radical shift of the European centre, it would have affected the equilibrium of the whole Western world.

The installation of a Central European monarchy had never been meant to remain the gravitational centre of former Hapsburg provinces only. It had been designed to attract States outside its dynastic pull.

One of these was Poland, whom the Vatican had previously designated as the potential kernel of a Catholic Federation of States in Central Europe—*Isthmus* being a case in point. Many Catholic Poles read in it the Vatican's identification, and hence the Vatican's promotion, of it with the distortedly magnified Polish political and geographical expansionistic dreams epitomized in Pilsudski's Danzig-Odessa line.

Vatican duplicity, however, while encouraging such schemes, had been simultaneously promoting another, whose ultimate objective ran dead against the Polish one—namely, the setting up of a Catholic Confederation, centred round Austria-Hungary, presided over by the Hapsburgs. This had been promoted long before *Isthmus* was crushed. And what is undoubtedly even more significant is the fact that Catholic Poland, according to this plan, had been destined to lose her independence through her prompt incorporation into the Hapsburg-dominated Central European Federation.

This had been decided as far back as the First World War. Proofs of this villainous scheme exist both in Vienna and at the Vatican. In the note which Benedict XV sent to Berlin in 1917, when he attempted to bring about a separate peace in order to save the Hapsburg Dynasty, the Pope proposed, among

other things, that "the regulation of the territorial questions between Austria and Italy" be compensated for by the *devolution to the Austrian monarchy of the Polish Crown*.⁶

The Pope's devolution offer was never abrogated. It remained an integral feature of the Mindszenty scheme, which was implemented in the Mindszenty-Otto-Spellman U.S.A. conversations. This meant that, had the Mindszenty plan succeeded, Poland's independence would have been *once more* ruthlessly sacrificed to further the Vatican's political ambitions, as it had been so often in the past.

The Polish incorporation, however, had an even bigger significance when it is considered that it had been intended only as the first move for vaster territorial and political acquisitions. Territorial absorption into the Hapsburg federal orbit, in fact, had been contemplated in other regions in addition to the north—e.g. Catholic Bavaria, prior to Adenauer's Western Germany—which the Americans, then in occupation, would have been "persuaded" to join.⁷

That was not all. The extensive negotiations with Otto and Spellman dealt also with the status of the Ukrainians. For the Catholic Hapsburg federation proposed to detach from Soviet Russia that vast region as well.

The implementation of such political changes would have been impossible without violent commotion. The success of Mindszenty's policy and final completion of its ultimate objective, therefore, rested on the fall, not of the Hungarian Republic alone, but also of neighbouring governments.

Political intrigues, even when supported by the combined might of the Vatican and the U.S.A., would not have been sufficient in themselves to bring about the overthrow of these governments. Only military intervention from *abroad*, combined with armed insurrection *within*, could bring about the collapse of Hungary and her neighbouring Central European Republics.

Military intervention being impossible in peace-time, this meant that war was contemplated. We have already seen the advanced stage of the plans of the invisible government of the U.S.A. at this period. American-Russian relations were almost at breaking-point. War in such circumstances meant only one thing: a third World War.

Cardinal Mindszenty had enough honesty frankly to acknowledge this when he stated that "*We thought the restoration could only be achieved with help from abroad,*" adding that he himself had contemplated assuming the function of head of the State, "*in case a new world war created such a situation.*" Indeed, while reiterating that he "did not wish for a war," he had at the same time to admit: "*I regarded it as a basis*" (for his political activities). The success of these activities depended upon the international situation "*getting worse,*" the outbreak of a general war having become "the starting-point" for his plans. He had considered such an event to be swiftly forthcoming, as "in the spring of that year [1947] it was strongly rumoured that a third World War might come about," in which the Americans would win.⁸

To such an extent had the venomous bacilli of political lust for power infected some leaders of that Church whose mission, her head, the Pope, is so fond of proclaiming, is to bring peace on earth and goodwill to all men.

The loss of a battle has never spelt defeat. Hence the continuation of wars, however grievous single or numerous setbacks may be.

The Vatican's promotion of the Hapsburg project, although checked, was by no means stopped by the removal of Mindszenty. The Cardinal was promptly replaced by his second-in-command, Archbishop Josef Grosz, Chairman of the Board of Hungarian Bishops. Mgr. Grosz, in fact, immediately after Mindszenty's arrest, simply informed the U.S. legation that he had become "temporary head of the State," in the absence of the King and of the Prince Primate, pending restoration of the Hapsburg Monarchy.

Mindszenty's work was carried on by him, inspired as before by those political good companions, Cardinal Spellman, Mgr. Montini, Pius XII, the U.S.A., and a motley of discontented Catholic Hungarians, among them Mindszenty's confidential political adviser, Father Bozsik, former member of Admiral Horthy's Fascist Parliament; Dr. Euclides Farkas, Holy See prosecutor; and Dom V. Endredy, Cistercian abbot.⁹

The American State Department, which by this period

(about 1950), unlike in Mindszenty's era, had been supplied with abundant funds to carry out "special activities abroad," on the model of the famous American Mutual Security Act of 1951, when, as already mentioned, the U.S. Government officially granted 100,000,000 dollars to be specifically spent on espionage and sabotage in Central European countries, pledged to Mgr. Grosz Marshall Aid, unlimited "financial assistance," and, indeed, "military help."

After two and a half years of such activities, Archbishop Grosz in his turn was arrested, found guilty, and sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment (June 28, 1951).¹⁰

Again the Vatican moaned, but not as loudly as at Mindszenty's trial. "Another crime against freedom and human dignity," was its matter-of-fact, grieved comment.¹¹ And it continued as vigorously as before to conduct its political machinations, not only in Hungary but also in several other Central European regions. For example, in Rumania, where the inspirer of the Rumanian "Mindszenty" was Mgr. Patrick O'Hara, an American prelate acting officially as the Papal Nuncio to Bucharest, *de facto* as the head of the Vatican ideological warfare, and the organizer of the hierarchy's political and related activities. Mgr. O'Hara, having overdone his role, was finally expelled, leaving some of his accomplices in jail or, indeed, before the execution squads (July, 1950).

Pius XII, that consummate master of intrigue, appreciated Mgr. O'Hara's work so much that, following his expulsion, he promptly decorated his Eminence for "special services"—carefully avoiding, however, disclosing their nature. The essential political exertions of O'Hara having been patterned on the Hungarian model, it followed that revolutionary activities were co-ordinated, as in Hungary, by the Catholic hierarchy, under the joint leadership of Mgr. O'Hara and a Romanian hierarch, Bishop Pacha.

Mgr. Pacha had a political record which had greatly endeared him to both Pius XII and the U.S. State Department. As early as 1934, only one year after the Nazis went into power, he went to see Hitler, in order to counsel him "to carry out an Eastern military campaign"—i.e. against Soviet Russia. Mgr. Pacha at this period had a great friend, the

former Papal Nuncio to Berlin, who repeatedly advised him to maintain very close contact with Hitler, so as to spur the Fuehrer to follow a policy advantageous to the right political evolution of the Balkans and the mobilization of Christianity against the source of the Bolshevik scourge. The former Papal Nuncio to Berlin: Eugenio Pacelli, later Pope Pius XII.¹²

Bishop Pacha not only did whatever his friend Pacelli had counselled him to do; prior to and during the Second World War he actually organized a Catholic-Nazi fifth column in Rumania.¹² After the War he promoted a veritable intelligence network, with ramifications in the Italian, French, and American Legations in Bucharest. Substantial sums of American dollars, which had been deposited by the Papal Nunciature in the Swiss legation of the Rumanian capital, were used for the financing of a Catholic-led underground organization called the Christian Socialist Party. The movement included three Catholic bishops, among them Bishop Boros, who had acted as joint Vatican-American Intelligence link since 1948.

In September, 1951, six members of the Rumanian hierarchy, including the three bishops, were arrested, convicted, and condemned. Bishop Pacha was sentenced to eighteen years' imprisonment.¹³

The Catholic and American Press uttered lamentations. "The Communist persecutions behind the Iron Curtain" had "surpassed the persecutions of Nero." Christians were being imprisoned and sentenced to death "simply because they dared to preach the gospel of Christ." The official voice of the Vatican joined the chorus, and a solemn excommunication against all those who in Rumania had "persecuted or had interfered with the servants of the Church" was promptly hurled from Rome.¹⁴

While cardinals, archbishops, and bishops went to jail for the glory of deposed kings, Archduke Otto of Hapsburg, heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne, after a cheerful courtship, married Princess Regina of Saxe-Meiningen, at Nancy, capital of Lorraine (May 10, 1951). During the nuptial Mass Otto knelt on cushions filled with Austrian earth. On leaving the chapel he passed under the crossed sabres of former officers of the Imperial Hapsburg Hungarian Army. The large crowd,

among which were thousands who had come "by way of the Monarchist underground," greeted him with ominous cries of "Long Live *the Emperor!*"

Ex-Empress Zita, fourteen archdukes, sixteen princes, and the representatives of a dozen royal families had convened to give impetus to "a new long-term effort to popularize *the Emperor.*"¹⁵

Messages were sent to the "Emperor" from Catholic Austria, Croatia, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Hungary; from the Catholics of Rumania; from the American State Department; the whole crowned by special felicitations from Otto's very special protector, His Holiness the Pope:

"We ask the eternal and very loving God," wrote Pius XII, in his letter to Otto,

that you be faithful to the virtues of your father, and that you be accorded a long life gladdened by peace.¹⁶

After which, the "Emperor," burdened with additional marital responsibility, greatly enlivened by the Papal blessing and by a large dollar gift from Cardinal Spellman, on the direct invitation of Catholic Dictator Franco went honeymooning in sunny Fascist Spain.

The following month horror chilled the spine of His Holiness, Pius XII; a horror shared by some hypersensitive policy-makers in the State Department of democratic U.S.A. The Reds had again blackened their already tenebrous record by infringing upon the most sacrosanct rights of freedom. In a most plebeian attempt to ennoble the members of the proletariat, the Hungarian Atheists had "debased human dignity" to such a degree that they simply passed a law making it compulsory for six Hungarian dukes, forty-one Hungarian barons, and fifty-two Hungarian counts to work like ordinary *hominidis*.¹⁷

The Catholic-American dinosaurian Press wrung their hearts out over such brutish misfortune. The Western masses, however, having learned the basic lesson that to eat they always had to work, shed not a solitary tear over their toiling Hungarian lordships.

The *Osservatore Romano* gulped in surprise. His Holiness Pius XII, a member of the Roman Academy of the Nobles,

celebrated an extra Mass. Luce's enlightened organs proclaimed that, when the twentieth century had truly become the "American Century," such a terrible thing would never be permitted to happen—particularly wherever *Time*, *Life*, and *Fortune* were made to circulate in all Western educational institutions.¹⁸

For the Papal and dinosaurian allies the condemnation of sundry members of the Central European nobility—indeed, the implied threat to the very scions of the Hapsburg Dynasty to soil their immaculate fingers with labour—was another proof that Otto and all his purpled and military counsellors deserved the unstinted support of all true defenders of "civilization." That is to say, of that civilization inspired and supported by Catholicism and dinosaurian Americanism, of which the Popes (who received direct divine messages from revolving suns), and the Pierpont Morgans (who got billions out of American workers), the General MacArthurs (who advocated extending Asiatic wars), and the Luces (who were enriching contemporary culture with *unbiased* historical writing), were the outstanding knights *sans honte et sans peur*.

The knights of the Middle Ages, like their codes, swords, and times, belong to the past. Monarchies, princes, cardinal primates, aristocracies, or monstrous economic dinosaurs, like them, are dangerous anachronisms, wholly alien to the thunderous civilization of the twentieth century.

History has always broken those who have attempted to put back the clock. It broke the Manchu Dynasty, it broke the Russian Czars, it broke the German Kaisers; it broke several European dictators, the Mikados of Pearl Harbours, the Chiang Kai Sheks of the American "China lobby." It broke Mindszenty. It will break others. Until, in due course, it will break also the great economic and political dinosaurs of the world, their dead bones to serve as a most ignoble sepulchre for that other worthy anachronism—the Roman Catholic Church.

21

THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME: GLOBAL CATHOLIC TERROR AND THE FUTURE

THE SPECTACULAR RISE OF POLITICAL Catholicism following the tumbling of Nazified Europe, more than an omen for the present, was a portent for the future.

Diverse and colossal factors—chief among them the astounding expansion of Communism, with its parallel phenomenal creation of fear, skilfully manipulated by an alert, master-minded Catholic diplomacy—contributed to the emergence of this Catholic prodigy. The quasi-Utopian Catholic scheme was relegated neither to the unpredictable adventures of uncharted political seas nor to the caprices of a spontaneous growth in the miasmatic Western diplomatic jungle. It was swiftly developed into a coolly planned, solidly political proposition by the vigorous prosecution of ambitious political designs: the erection of a Catholic-dominated Western Europe, the projected restoration of a Hapsburg Central European orbit, the two to be completed by a third—i.e. the creation of one monolithic political unit, in the shape of some kind of European Confederation or United States of Europe.

The first of these was fulfilled with such rapidity that within

five years (1945-50) ten Western European nations—that is to say, almost the whole of Western Europe—had come to be ruled by Catholic governments.¹

The simultaneous promotion of the scheme directed at the radical transformation of Central Europe into a Catholic-dominated realm, running parallel as it did with Catholic-inspired advocacy of economic, political, and even military European unity,² supported by the U.S.A., after less than a decade got within a hair's breadth of realization.

Its implementation, feasible in a near future, could decisively alter the destiny of Europe. For a Europe welded together by political Catholicism soon would become as alien to a Europe inspired by genuine democracy as one under the iron heel of the most ferocious dictatorship. Such a Europe would swiftly be transformed into a mighty tool of Catholic aggression: a continent like that of the Middle Ages, when Catholicism reduced the West to a spineless Papal fief.

A West top-heavy with political Catholicism, however, would be more perilous to universal freedom than a Catholic medieval Europe. The medieval West meant Europe. Now the West includes the Atlantic and the Americas. Two-thirds of these—the southern and central portions—are politically ruled by the Church. The north—i.e. the U.S.A.—has already been so penetrated that its domestic and foreign policies are substantially influenced by Catholic political aggressiveness.

A Catholic-dominated United Europe, plus a Catholic-dominated American continent, would thus spell a Catholic-dominated West. This in its turn would result in an even more ominous portent: a Catholic political domination of the world.

The West, at least for the next few brief decades, will probably continue to act as the kernel of the globe. Hence the non-Western world being influenced, even if with diminishing rapidity, by the nature of Western political designs. The inspirers of the latter, by the simplest law of cause and effect, would be enabled to influence the affairs of African and Asiatic nations, including Communist China and Soviet Russia.

A Vatican exerting religious and political pressure, or a combination of both, upon a subservient West, consequently, would, even if by remote control, direct Western and world

politics at will, and would do so exclusively to further its own policy: the world advancement of Catholicism.

This is not speculation. It is a policy which has already been pursued, although with discretion, in the European region. It was epitomized by the Vatican's promotion of Fascism in general and of Catholic Fascism in particular, between the First and Second World Wars.

The first phase of the Vatican's long-range objective was directed at capturing the Western world. Vatican encouragement of external American belligerency, parallel with its devastating penetration into the American domestic citadel following the Second World War, was the second. Were it to be successful in this—that is, were it ultimately to come to dominate the North American region—then its goal of domination over the entire West would truly be reached.

The last fifty years have seen the Vatican ride behind, and then beside, mighty political allies: first Nazi Europe and then dinosaurian U.S.A. The next fifty, unless unforeseeable events intervene, will see the Vatican first lead, and then dominate, its new partners: a Confederated or United Europe and the American hemisphere.

What would be the ultimate significance of Catholic-dominated European and American continents in terms of political evolution and, more portentous still, in terms of human liberty?

A West with the Vatican as its arbiter would spell a ruthless Vatican attempt at imposing Catholic dominion upon the human race. That would mean but one thing: the forcible application of Catholic doctrines upon individuals, nations, and cultures, the imposition of that most sinister of all soul-destroying tyrannies: Papal tyranny.

To speak of Papal tyranny in a world rocked by dictatorships of immense magnitude and in a century that has seen the rise of gigantic violators of human freedom seems a pathetic demonstration of either an outdated fanaticism or a *naïveté* worthy of pity rather than scornful rejection. Yet Catholic terror is not a myth; it is a most ruthless reality. It is not merely a thing of the past; it is hidden in the present. It can still tear to shreds the near and the distant future.

The mood of the contemporary world has immobilized most

of its tentacles, and has circumscribed its ruthlessness within the innermost chambers of its theological teachings, forcing into the most inaccessible crevices of its fabric all its most repellent features. Hence the sly softening and even superficial transformations of its most hideous claims. A mollification cunningly encouraged, the better to permit them to take hold of that society which they mean to destroy by a slow, painless strangulation, like an insidious, thousand-rooted ivy silently squeezing the life out of a mighty oak tree.

To this end, Catholicism, chameleon-like, has skilfully apparelled itself in the vestments of democracy, which it abhors with unearthly hate. As a result, contemporary society has accepted it as one of its truest defenders; Christian denominations as a paladin of religious toleration; Liberals as a champion of human liberties; many innocents even as the most redoubtable foe of all the tyrannies which have so far threatened the human race. Such has been Catholicism's success in disguising its true nature. Another proof that in the immoral art of deception it is still unsurpassed.

Yet, of all the tyrannies which are still menacing mankind, none is so sinisterly dangerous as the Catholic Church. This many will reject with scorn. The monstrous administrations of Fascist and Communist dictatorships, the growing incubus of atomic incineration, are too fearsome realities to bear resemblance to anything else.

Yet if giants have turned into monstrous perils, the bacilli which have brought them to insanity are surely no less perilous. Hence the producers and carriers of such bacilli are far more terrible realities than even the maddened creatures now threatening the earth with destruction.

The Catholic Church is the greatest producer of bacilli the world has ever seen. Some of the most dangerous explosions—such as the wars of religion, the French and Russian revolutions, and, to a great extent, the delirium tremens which at present is shaking the West—have been partially ignited by her. Her stubborn advocacy of a traditional society brimful of injustices has contributed—more, perhaps, than any other single non-economic, non-political factor—to the emergence of Communism. Her stubborn enmity against Communism has helped to produce Fascism. Fascism produced war. The sum

of all this has brought contemporary society to such a point that its two hostile halves are simultaneously preparing to annihilate each other.

But if political domination seems to be the Catholic Church's ultimate goal, that is not an end in itself. The Catholic Church lusts for political domination in order, by becoming mighty through such political power, to force herself upon an unwilling society.

That would mean annihilation of all the liberties that man has gained with so many tears and that he is so piteously trying to protect from the devastating blows of the advancing tide of thriving, ruthless, ideological tyrannies.

The planting of Catholic standards in a Catholic-dominated world would not be confined to the enforcement of Catholicism, Franco-fashion.

Franco's Spain, where religious and political liberties were non-existent, was not a true example of what total Catholic domination would mean. In Fascist Spain Catholicism was never fully applied. This because its total implementation, while advantageous to the Church within Spain, would have imperilled her whole strategy of befriending contemporary society, particularly in the U.S.A., with a view to its swifter penetration and ultimate conquest.

But were the pursuance of such a global policy of penetration to become unnecessary—that is, were Catholicism to feel so strong that it could with impunity scorn world opinion—then, all caution having been thrown to the wind, its tenets would promptly be applied in their totality.

The States, having to be erected wholly upon them, would have to be clerical authoritarianisms or plain dictatorships; their social structures, being wholly inspired by Catholic social teachings, would systematize inequalities; their whole fabric, being impregnated only with Catholicism, would become as alien to genuine democracy as the hierocracy of the Middle Ages is alien to the democratic republics hailed by modern man.

In such a society anything extraneous to Catholicism would be eliminated; freedom of conscience, equality of religions, and all the other liberties of a democratic world, would be made to vanish. Everyone would have to conform to the spirit and

letter of such a society. Anyone opposing it would be exterminated. Non-Catholics and non-Christians would have to embrace Catholicism. Resisters would be forcibly converted. Stubborn refusal would be punished by death. Neither men, women, nor children would be spared. Individual and mass murders inspired by the hierarchy would be faithfully carried out by pious Catholics, if not by the priests themselves. Total annihilation of dissension would cease only when not a single non-Catholic was left within such a society. Were such a society to embrace the whole of the West, it would mean that not a single non-Catholic would be permitted to survive there; were it to embrace the whole world, that every single non-Catholic would be wiped from the face of the earth by either persuasion, terror, forcible conversion, or a Catholic sword.

Speculations of this character will be rejected as morbid abominations. But what if they should not be mere fantasy? What if they should have occurred? Not in the past, when the Church destroyed whole provinces by the sword, as it did with the Albigenses, or executed heretics like John Huss, or burned philosophers like Giordano Bruno; but now, in this our twentieth century?

And if, to crown all this, witnesses whose mothers, fathers, and brothers were either forcibly converted or massacred for refusing to "embrace the true Church" were ready to vouch for the authenticity of such monstrosities: could anyone still consider the Catholic Church a defender of civilization, which many regard as a claim genuinely befitting her?

The objection that, even if true, such horrors have been and still are committed by some contemporary political dictatorships does not deserve serious consideration. For here we are dealing with a Church claiming to preach human brotherhood. No Church can justify the extirpation of liberty, the massacre of hundreds of thousands, on the grounds that political tyrannies have done the same. Anyone excusing such conduct deserves universal abhorrence. Just because mankind is still terrorized by certain ideological movements, a Church acting likewise so as to enforce her dominion deserves to be condemned a thousandfold more than the greatest of all contemporary tyrannies exterminating in the name of political philosophies conceived by man, and not, like the Catholic Church,

in the name of a religious system which, she claims, is inspired, ordained, and willed by God.

The aberrations of total Catholic domination have truly happened: in the Western world and in this, our twentieth century. They are here succinctly narrated. Because they occurred within narrow geographical confines, for a short duration, and escaped almost unnoticed, they should not be minimized or, worse still, ignored.

For they give us a true glimpse of what total Catholic rule is holding in store for the future of mankind.

.

Their geographical region and historical background were restricted to Central Europe, and were closely related to Pilsudski's Danzig-Odessa Line, to Prelate Seipel's Papal Central European Federation, put forward after the First World War, and to the Otto-Spellman-Mindszenty scheme centred upon a Hapsburg reinstatement, jointly promoted by the Vatican and the U.S.A. after the Second World War.

The political events, briefly narrated, are as follows.

When the Hapsburg Empire tumbled, among the young nations which sprang from its ruins was Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia came to the fore topped by a monarchy, the symbol of the union of three diverse groups which had decided to unite under it on the basis of their close racial and linguistic bonds: the Serbs, the Croats, and the Slovenes.

Her birth was greeted with a warm welcome from certain quarters, a hostile reception from others. The latter fell into two distinct groups: those inside Yugoslavia, represented mainly by currents advocating separatism, and those outside, represented by certain nations with territorial or political ambitions. Both soon began to play a disproportionate role in the domestic and foreign affairs of the new country.

As the fulfilment of their respective goals depended upon the thwarting—and, in fact, upon the final disintegration—of Yugoslavia, it followed that, having combined, they agreed upon a joint policy epitomized by the formulation of a mutually beneficial strategy. The paramount weapon of those within: the stirring up of racial prejudices amid the diverse groups, upon which there depended the unity of the young

nation; of those without: the promotion of an international ostracism of Yugoslavia, with a view to an eventual military attack.

Seemingly in the background, but in reality well to the fore, religious antagonism, having been promptly identified with nationalistic grievances, was made to play an increasingly dangerous role in the series of events which swiftly followed.

The most perilous of all: that existing between the Serbs and the Croats. The Serbs were Orthodox, the Croats Catholic. For anyone planning to start trouble, the encouraging of the Orthodox-Catholic friction was the surest way of getting prompt disruptive political dividends.

Chief among the trouble-seekers inside Yugoslavia: the Nationalist Croats; outside, the Vatican.

The Croats wanted a sovereign Catholic State of Croatia. The Vatican wanted to prevent Orthodox Serbia from "keeping in subjugation a Catholic nation"—i.e. Croatia.

Vatican anti-Serbian enmity was of ancient standing. In the days when a substantial portion of Serbian territory was under the Hapsburg rule—e.g. Bosnia, Herzegovina, Srem, Banat, North Dalmatia, and other provinces—that is to say, prior to the First World War—Vatican hostility was frequently vented upon the proud but helpless Serbs by the Pope, acting through Francis Joseph. That most Catholic Emperor, who had a personal dislike for "those most rebellious Serbs," had always piously implemented any Papal counsels about the treatment to be meted out to the "most impious heretical Orthodox." The last, most fateful, example of such advice: that given by Pius X, when His Holiness encouraged the old Emperor to employ the severest measures against Orthodox Serbia after the assassination at Sarajevo; advice which, as already mentioned, greatly helped to precipitate the First World War.

From the very beginning, the Hapsburg troops—that is to say, during the invasion of Machva, Croatian Catholic regiments—carried out the most horrible massacres against Orthodox Serb populations; this in sharp contrast to Czech soldiers, many of whom went over to the Serbs.

Since her inception, the unity of Yugoslavia was achieved primarily through the efforts of the Orthodox Serbs, assisted by the Serbo-Croatian Coalition, which had existed since 1905.

From the birth of Yugoslavia, the Vatican attempted to take hold of the country via the penetration of Catholic Croats into the Yugoslav administration. Radic, although a Catholic Croat, as leader of the truly democratic forces of Croatia drastically opposed such a policy. However, when he died in 1928, Dr. Machek, having inherited the leadership of the Croatian Peasant Party, reshaped it into a nationalist movement advocating Croat Separatism. In 1928 King Alexander set up a dictatorship, which helped to foster Machek's new policy. From then onward the Vatican, having abandoned its previous tactics of subtle penetration, embarked upon a blatant policy advocating separation.

Yugoslavia, therefore, as a Serbian-Orthodox political unit, became a growing challenge to Catholic influence in the Balkans. Last but not least, she was a barrier obstructing the promotion of one of the Vatican's pet political schemes: the restoration of the Hapsburgs. The reinstatement of that Empire implied the reunion of its former provinces. That meant that, as long as Yugoslavia existed, Catholic Slovenia and Catholic Croatia would have been prevented from returning under the Hapsburg crown.

By the mere fact of her existence, consequently, Yugoslavia came to be regarded as a major obstacle in the path of the Vatican's post-War grand strategy. Vatican policy, having as its objective the removal of that obstacle, was therefore inspired from the very start by unremitting hostility to anything Yugoslav. Such hostility, when translated into diplomatic parlance, had as its main goals: (a) the detachment of Catholic Croatia from the rule of Orthodox Serbia; (b) the setting up of Croatia as an independent Catholic State; and (c) the restoration of a Hapsburg Empire in Central and Eastern Europe.

The prerequisite for their fulfilment: partial or total disintegration of Yugoslavia. For over twenty years—namely from 1919 to 1941, when this disintegration was completed—Vatican policy was stubbornly steered towards the achievement of such goals.

To assert that Yugoslavia's fall was provoked only by the Vatican would be to distort history. On the other hand, to minimize the part it played would be a crude historical falsification.

As in other cases, factors alien to religion played into its hands—e.g. the real racial animosities of the Croats and the Serbs and the political ambitions of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany.

The policies of these nations often ran parallel with that of the Vatican, with the result that, by skilfully manipulating them, the Vatican very often greatly promoted its own interests. This it did, not by remaining merely the schemer of a long-range policy and therefore an aloof spectator of the exertions of its Croat, Fascist, and Nazi allies, but, on the contrary, by vigorously carrying out its own and supporting their anti-Yugoslav policies in a most matter-of-fact fashion.

Thus, while Italy and Germany were busy engineering political or terroristic activities, the Vatican—as in Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, and France—came to the fore with the promotion of a powerful Catholic fifth column. This had gnawed at the internal structure of Yugoslav unity like a veritable destructive termite since the very beginning, and consisted of almost all Croats, infected with national-religious fanaticism; of the Catholic hierarchy of Croatia; and of an illegal Nationalist-Catholic Army composed of bands of Catholic terrorists, called the Ustashi. These groups were led by the devout Ante Pavelich; by Vladimir Macech, leader of the Croat Peasant Party, who in 1939 arranged for Mussolini to finance him with 20,000,000 dinars for the Croat Separatist Movement;³ and by Archbishop A. Stepinac, leader of the Catholic hierarchy in Croatia.

For years these men nursed, helped, and protected military, political, and religious underground Separatist movements, with a view to having them sabotage the Central Government and cause its downfall.

The specific role played by the Vatican followed the familiar pattern: use of the Catholic hierarchy to help political and military plotters engaged in undermining or overthrowing the legal government. What differentiates the Yugoslav case from all the others, however, is the fact that, unlike in other countries—e.g. Petain's France or Franco's Spain—here the Catholic Church attempted to, and indeed did, erect a Catholic State in complete accord with all her tenets. The result was a tyranny of such a repulsive nature as to become one of the

most outstanding monsters yet seen, even in this our century. Such a monster was the direct offspring of a religious tyranny, reflecting the political counterpart of a most intolerant religious totalitarianism: the spiritual totalitarianism of the Catholic Church. In short, the inevitable result of Catholic claims when freely applied in their entirety.

This is what gives to this creature of Vatican diplomacy its peculiar importance. For here we have an almost unique example of the Catholic Church setting out to erect all the principles which we have examined earlier in this book into a monolithic religious-political unit, the like of which had not been seen for centuries. This unit was wholly impregnated by her spirit and tenets, unhampered by opposition, fear of world opinion, or by the practising of that caution which at present characterizes all her religious and political exertions.

The uniqueness of the Catholic State of Croatia lies precisely in this fact: that it was a miniature model of what the Catholic Church, had she the power, would like to see in the West and, indeed, throughout the world.

As such, it should be closely examined. For its significance, by transcending its local background, is of the greatest import, not only to the nations of Europe, but also to all the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

One day early in 1933 an official of the Austrian Government approached an Austrian railwayman and offered him a large sum as the price for his silence. The railwayman refused, informed his union, and what the Catholic Austrian dictator, Dolfuss, had attempted to hush up was promptly made known to the Press. Europe blinked at what was then revealed, and many a Chancellery was set in turmoil. A few months before, the railway trade unionists had discovered that an armaments factory at Hinterberg, in lower Austria, was producing rifles, not, as it was believed, for the Austrian Army but for semi-Fascist Hungary. Important personages in the Government were helping the smuggling. Most of them, it was discovered by the Socialists, were fervent Catholics, semi-Fascists, or plain, rabid Fascists.

The disclosure created a sensation. For at that period,

neither Austria nor Hungary was supposed to be dealing in arms. That was not all. The weapons, it was found, had been ordered, not for Hungary but for Fascist Italy. The rifles were directed to Hungary only as a temporary storehouse. Their ultimate destination was with the Catholic nationalists of Croatia, who were plotting a rising, with a view to detaching themselves from the kingdom of Yugoslavia.

But more was yet to come. The Croats were not alone. They had acted with powerful allies in various foreign countries. This transformed their scheme into an international plot of the first magnitude, as a result of which political-religious factors were playing a paramount role in the domestic and foreign policies of several European nations. Chief among these: Fascist Italy.

Fascist Italy at that period had developed ambitions which she intended to achieve at Yugoslavia's expense. These contemplated the partial mutilation of that country by the Italian incorporation of Dalmatia. The promotion of such a policy could result in war. Mussolini knew this well, and toyed with the idea of bringing about Yugoslav disintegration by force of arms.

This fitted the plan of the Croats, for Yugoslav dismemberment would have given them the opportunity to detach themselves from Serbia, set up an independent Croatia, and install the Hapsburg Monarchy, as a first step to a potential full resurrection of the Hapsburg Empire.

The Hapsburg resurrection was not the dream of the Croat insurgents alone. Others, as we have already seen, among them Catholic Dictator Dolfuss and sundry Catholics in Hungary, were engaged on the promotion of the same scheme.

Mussolini, the most powerful Fascist dictator of that time, therefore, being in the position to bring about such changes, became the main hope of all those who, besides being supported by him, were simultaneously backing his anti-Yugoslav policy. In the case of the Croats, such support was of a most concrete character. Realizing how their interests ran parallel with his, they came to a swift understanding with the Fascist dictator: the disintegration of Yugoslavia would be accomplished via an external attack launched by Fascist Italy and a simultaneous internal one launched by Croat Monarchists.

While this joint strategy was being worked out, a new factor appeared swiftly on the horizon: Hitler. At the elongating Hitlerian shadow adumbrating with alarming celerity the Central European landscape, Mussolini became cautious. Hesitation weakened his resolution. And soon the whole projected Yugoslav adventure, having turned unwholesomely risky, was shelved, in the hope of better times.

Fascist abandonment of the project had been inspired by sound reasons. Nazi Germany had developed an aggressive Central European policy of her own.

At this new development Yugoslavia grew even more alarmed and appealed to England and France. The latter came forward with a European Security scheme. Its object: curtailment of Fascist-Nazi Balkan ambitions. Yugoslavia accepted the offer of a strong defensive alliance; negotiations were initiated, and in 1934 Yugoslavia and France made ready to seal them with a treaty. This implied a French guarantee of Yugoslav independence; that is to say, Yugoslav territorial inviolability. To those who had erected their political castles upon a potential Yugoslav disintegration, therefore, the treaty spelt one thing: indefinite postponement of all their hopes. The implementation of the French-sponsored European Security scheme therefore had to be prevented at all costs. The two most powerful Fascist dictators in Europe gnashed their teeth and seemingly resigned themselves to the inevitable.

Not so the Catholic Croats, who set out to concoct the most fantastic schemes with a view to preventing the Yugoslav-French treaty from being signed.

In the autumn of that same year, 1934, King Alexander of Yugoslavia, at the invitation of the main architect of the European Security programme—namely, the French Foreign Minister Barthou—officially visited France. Barthou welcomed the King at Marseilles. As they were riding through the streets of the city a shower of bullets hit them. Both King and French Foreign Minister were killed. Consequent investigations soon established that the double murder had been carried out by Croat Nationalists. Indeed, the murdering had been supplied with money, weapons, and false passports by the Nazi authorities in Munich, by Mussolini, and by the semi-Fascist Dictator of Hungary, Admiral Horthy. The

leader and soul of the gang, Ante Pavelich,⁴ was sentenced to death, *in absentia*, by a French court.

Ante Pavelich's life-dream had been a sovereign Catholic State of Croatia, where the Catholic Church and the reinstated Hapsburg Monarchy could rule supreme, standing like a rock in the midst of the Orthodox sea. His followers shared his dream. The Vatican had blessed the project from the very inception, Pavelich having been granted double Vatican and Fascist protection for the many years during which he resided in Italy as a privileged exile.

From there, Pavelich, ominously in touch with Catholic and Fascist authorities, directed plottings and intrigues, reverting now to Mussolini and now to Hitler, according to which of the two dictators' ambitions seemed to have the greater chance of prevailing. Pavelich's strategy consisted in submitting plans to both Mussolini and Hitler for waging a terrorist campaign throughout Yugoslavia, in order to force the Central Government to grant autonomy to Catholic Croatia. With the approaching storm of the Second World War, however, Hitler, having fitted Yugoslavia into a vaster scheme of his own, reorientated his policy and promoted one aimed at neutralizing Yugoslavia—indeed, at making of her an ally. In order not to antagonize the Yugoslav Government, Pavelich's activities were greatly reduced and officially discouraged.

Hitler's policy paid him handsome dividends. Yugoslavia not only stubbornly remained neutral; on March 25, 1941, she actually signed a pact with him, thus stepping right into the Nazi camp. Two days later, on March 27, 1941, an anti-Nazi *coup d'état*, carried out by General Mirkovich, unseated the pro-Nazi Yugoslav Government. While the rest of Yugoslavia celebrated the event, Zagreb, the Croat capital, received the news in cold, ominous silence; circulars, full of threats, were found on the doors of Serbs in Zagreb, and an atmosphere tense with expectation seized Croatia. On April 6, 1941, Hitler attacked Yugoslavia. Pavelich's dream, which until then had been punctuated merely by political assassinations, at long last was about to come true.

His vast underground Catholic organization, the Ustashi, which for years had been prepared for just such a day, was set into motion. Pavelich, having jumped into the limelight,

sided instantly with Hitler. His Ustashi initiated vigorous fighting in the rear of the Yugoslav Army, Croats within the Army simultaneously carrying out fifth-column activities to such an extent that nothing could be done according to plan. Croat officers fled to the Germans,⁵ to whom they disclosed vital information about air bases and so on. Units of the Croatian Peasant Guard disarmed units of the Yugoslav Army. The widespread disorganization created by Catholic Croats was such that it turned out to be one of the paramount factors in the swift Nazi conquest of Yugoslavia.

The promotion of such a large treacherous body within Yugoslavia would have been impossible without the active co-operation of the Catholic Church. Pavelich's terrorist bands, the Ustashi, had been morally and financially encouraged and supported by her. Indeed, their backbone had been formed by priests, monks, and even bishops. Monasteries had been used as the clandestine headquarters of the Ustashi long before the Nazi attack. Secret nationalistic and military activities were disguised under the cloak of religion. The Catholic priesthood in Croatia, Herzegovina, and Dalmatia, for years convoked so-called Eucharistic Congresses which, in reality, were for extremist political purposes (e.g. those held in Pozega as late as 1940, under the fictitious name of Mary's Congregation). The various para-military, illegal, terrorist movements were likewise screened by the mantle of religion. Most of them were affiliated with Catholic organizations under the direct supervision of Catholic Action, which was strictly controlled by the Croatian hierarchy—for example, the Brotherhood of the Crusaders, with about 540 societies and 30,000 members; the Sisterhood of the Crusaders, with 452 societies and 19,000 members; the Catholic Student Associations, Domagoj, and others.

Most of the members of such religious organizations were active in sabotage and acts of terrorism, and a good number of them even participated in the treacherous disarming of the Yugoslav Army following Hitler's attack. As soon as they came out into the open, many of them appeared transformed into Ustashi authorities, functionaries in Ustashi commissions, heads of district councils, or even of concentration camps. The President of the Great Crusaders' Brotherhood, Dr. Feliks

Niedzelski, was nominated Ustashi Vice-Governor of Bosnia and administrative head for the Ustashi youth, while Father Grga Peinovic, also a director of Catholic Crusaders, was appointed President of the Ustashi Central Propaganda Office.⁶ Many of the priests of the Crusaders' Brotherhood and of Catholic Action took or gave military training, or were sworn officers of the Ustashi formations—e.g. Father Radoslaw Glavas, a Franciscan monk, who on April 10 and 11, 1941, disarmed the local gendarmerie, captured the post office, and drew local plans to prevent the mobilization of the Yugoslav Army; or Father Chaplain Ivan Miletic, who, in collaboration with the Nazis, led bands of guerillas against the Yugoslav Government.

On April 10, 1941, the German Army entered the capital of Croatia. On that same day the leader of the illegal Ustashi movement proclaimed the Independent State of Croatia, formed the first Ustashi Government, and soon afterwards, in true satellite fashion, declared war upon the Allies.

On April 12, while fighting between the Germans and the Yugoslav Army was still going on in the Bosnian mountains, Archbishop Stepinac called on the leader of the Ustashi, and urged all Croats to support the new Catholic State. On that very day the newspapers of Zagreb carried announcements to the effect that all Serbian Orthodox residents of the new Catholic capital must vacate the city within twelve hours. Anyone found harbouring an Orthodox would be executed.

On April 13 Ante Pavelich reached Zagreb from Italy. On April 14 Archbishop Stepinac went personally to meet him, to offer his congratulations on the fulfilment of Pavelich's life-work.

The Catholic hierarchy and the Catholic Press, following Stepinac's example, promptly initiated a feverish campaign of praise for Pavelich and Hitler :

God, who directs the destiny of nations and controls the hearts of Kings [wrote a leader of the Crusaders], has given us Ante Pavelich and moved the leader of a friendly and allied people, Adolf Hitler, to use his victorious troops to disperse our oppressors and enable us to create an Independent State of Croatia. Glory be to God, our gratitude to Adolf Hitler, and infinite loyalty to chief Ante Pavelich.⁷

A few days later (April 28, 1941) Stepinac issued a pastoral

letter asking the whole Croatian clergy to support and to defend the New Catholic State of Croatia.

At Easter, 1941, Stepinac announced from the Cathedral of Zagreb the establishment of the Independent State of Croatia, thus giving the solemn sanction of Church and Vatican to Pavelich's work. On June 28, 1941, Stepinac, with other bishops, went to see Pavelich. After promising the full-hearted co-operation of the whole hierarchy, the Archbishop solemnly blessed Pavelich as the leader of the Croatian people :

While we greet you cordially as head of the Independent State of Croatia, we implore the Lord of the Stars to give his divine blessings to you, the leader of our people.

Pavelich, it should be remembered, was the same man who had been sentenced to death for political assassinations : once by the Yugoslav Courts for his acts of terrorism, planned and carried out from Austria, Italy, and Hungary; the second time by the French, for the murders of King Alexander and the French Foreign Minister Barthou.

The murderer of King Alexander was blessed with equal enthusiasm also by Pius XII, who bestowed his paternal protection upon him and the new Croatian State.

That was not all. Saintly Pius XII, prior to his blessing, had spun some unholy diplomatic intrigues, with a view to giving his devout regicide, Pavelich, some kind of a king. For kings, as we have already seen, are still, next to strong Catholic dictators, the darling political dodos of the Church.

The Croatian throne had originally been assigned to Otto, the Hapsburg's scion. Hitler's anti-Hapsburg phobia, however, could not be forgotten. Hence the search for a king who could be *persona grata* with the Fuehrer. Catholic Providence is not only the provider of Peter's pence—or, to be more up to date, Peter's dollars; it can still provide that increasingly rare commodity : kings. Pius XII, privileged with visions of dead Papal predecessors,⁸ of zigzagging suns and sundry heavenly ethereal events, soon found one (after down-to-earth secret negotiations with Mussolini) : Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, "the august and wise Emperor of Ethiopia,"⁹ proclaimed such only three years earlier, after Mussolini had subdued Abyssinia.

To the chagrin of that most unholy trinity—Pope, Duce,

and Pavelich—King Victor, physically a midget of a man, protested that the weight of two crowns was already killing him, and refused. After a moment of confusion, Pius XII was once more divinely inspired, and (again after hasty secret consultation with Mussolini) found a substitute: the Duke of Spoleto, King Victor's cousin.

The Duke had been a mere duke all his life. The prospect of promotion went to his ducal head. So, having duly thanked his fairy godmothers—i.e. Adolf Hitler, the man who, from a mere private, had been promoted to the exalted rank of corporal in the democratic Hapsburg armies, and who subsequently promoted himself to the Chancellorship of Germany plus ex-Hapsburg Austria; and Hitler's friend, Pius XII, a mere member of the Roman nobility—he blushing accepted the regal sceptre. At the news that a king had been found, Ante Pavelich, accompanied by a Croatian delegation, went to Rome. There, on May 18, 1941, the ceremony of the acceptance of the Croatian crown by the new King took place.

Pius XII, while acting as a go-between for the bridal pair—i.e. the King and Croatia—being simultaneously the head of the Church, had to use caution. For millions of Catholics at that very moment were fighting on the side of the Allies to destroy that very Fascism with which the Holy Father was on such cordial terms. Besides which, Pius XII was also the head of the Vatican State. For him to extend official recognition to the new Axis creature would have been considered—by the democracies—a breach of "Papal neutrality."

Pius XII, the master priest-diplomat, remembered all the ambiguous Catholic theological paraphernalia, of which we have seen some classic dishonest examples—e.g. "equivocation" and "mental reservation"¹⁰—and, naturally, solved the problem triumphantly. He received the King-designate of Croatia *one day* before the ceremony of his coronation. That was no breach of "Papal neutrality," the future King having been seen by the Pope *before* he *officially* became King of Croatia.

The same day, the ceremony which proclaimed Croatia a kingdom took place. Pius XII granted Pavelich a long and very private audience, at which only one stenographer, brought by the devout murderer of King Alexander of Yugoslavia to record the interview, was present. After that the Pope

solemnly received and blessed Ante Pavelich's Prime Minister and his entire Croatian delegation. Was this a breach of "Papal neutrality"? Not at all! The Pope had received them, not as the heads of the Government of the New Croatia, but, quoting the *Osservatore Romano*, "as Catholic individuals."

The "Catholic individuals" had been specially received, specially blessed, and specially supported by His Holiness the Pope, not because they were merely Catholic individuals. Pius XII had granted them privileged treatment for the specific reason that, while members of the Church, they were also the representatives of a political creature, conceived, nurtured, and stubbornly promoted by the Vatican: the newly born sovereign Catholic State of Croatia.

From then onward the new State, under the special patronage of His Holiness the Pope, topped with a Catholic king, ruled by a Catholic terrorist, policed by Catholic bayonets, and protected by Hitler, set out to transform itself into an ideal Catholic State, as advocated by the Church.

Democracy, equality, and freedom were anathematized. A Fascist dictatorship appeared in their place. Ante Pavelich proclaimed himself the Great Leader, labelled his terroristic bands the National Army, and in no time turned Croatia into a pocket-size model of a Fascist-Nazi tyranny. A State however, according to Papal dicta, must be regulated by not only civil but also religious authority. So Pavelich, having determined that a religious equivalent of himself should partake of the rights and duties of rulership, saw to it that the head of the hierarchy became a *de facto* ruler of the new Croatia. Archbishop Stepinac, the Croatian Primate, and others, members of the hierarchy, the religious equivalent of the Ustashi, were duly elected members of the Sabor.

The military, political, and religious pillars of the new State having thus been erected, Pavelich and Stepinac set out to transform its whole structure into what a true Catholic-Fascist State should be.

From the very first day, Croatia was made to conform to the letter and spirit of Catholicism. All political parties were suppressed. Communists, Socialists, and Liberals were

arrested, imprisoned, and sent to concentration camps. Catholic teaching became compulsory in all schools. Trade unions were abolished. Freedom of speech and of the Press became memories of the past. Catholicism was declared the only religion of the State.

While Pavelich carried out such changes with the genteel co-operation of his storm-troops, Archbishop Stepinac facilitated his labours by a thorough mobilization of the Croatian Church, of the Croatian hierarchy, and of all the faithful. No occasion was ever let pass without his coming to the fore to praise, recommend, and bless the New Croatia, her Great Leader, and his Fascist protectors, Hitler and Mussolini.

On October 28, 1922, the first Fascist dictatorship had been installed in Italy. The event was celebrated yearly in that country with military parades reviewed by Mussolini himself. Archbishop Stepinac, although in Croatia, also annually celebrated the march on Rome with lyrical panegyrics and special prayers for the Duce.

Archiepiscopal panegyrics were bestowed even more generously upon Fascist Croatia during religious, political, and even military ceremonies. When the Sabor met, in February, 1942, Stepinac solemnly invoked the Holy Ghost to alight upon Pavelich's simian forebrow and upon the sharp-edged knives of his bands. When Pavelich's birthday dawned, the Archbishop celebrated an extra solemn Mass, gave special thanksgiving, and ordered special prayers in all churches on his behalf.¹¹ When Pavelich's pocket-size Navy departed for the Black Sea, to fight with the German ally against Soviet Russia, celebrations were held in Zagreb, attended by the Catholic hierarchy, headed by Stepinac and by the representative of Pius XII, Dr. Ramiro Marcone, the Papal Legate.

The Croat hierarchs followed their leader's example with the utmost zeal. E.g. Archbishop Saric, the intimate friend of Jure Francetic, Commander of the "Black Legion," who religiously used the Ustashi (i.e. the Fascist) salute in public and in private; or Bishop Aksamovic, of Djakovo, who was personally decorated by Pavelich because "His Excellency the Bishop has from the very beginning co-operated with the Ustashi authorities."

The political-religious leadership having thus become so

entwined as to be inseparable, political and religious leaders set out in earnest to bring about a ruthless, radical transformation, with the specific view of making of Croatia a one hundred per cent Catholic model State.

That implied not only transformation of the Croatian social, cultural, and political fabric, but radical extirpation of whatever was alien to Catholicism. This included all individuals not belonging to the Catholic Church and therefore not of Croat racial stock. That was a prerequisite for the erection of a monolithic Catholic Croatia. Hence the need for their total elimination. That was not an easy task, for a large portion of the new Croatia was composed of bulky racial-religious groups, wholly foreign to Croat-Catholicism.

Out of a population of 6,700,000, in fact, only 3,300,000 were Croats. Of the remainder, 700,000 were Moslems, 45,000 were Jews, followed by sundry smaller minorities. Over 2,000,000 were Orthodox Serbs.

The inclusion in the new Croatia of so many non-Catholics was due to the territorial ambitions of Croat Nationalism. These had been epitomized in the conception of "Greater Croatia," whose origin went back to the last century, when a Catholic Croat, Ante Starcevic, founded an extreme political party, the Croatian Law Party, subsequently elevated to the level of a Croatian national programme by Ante Pavelich. Whereas Starcevic was the theorist, Pavelich became the executive of the Party's ideology of racial and religious exclusiveness, based upon such a conception. This meant the inclusion in an independent Croatia of disputed territories, and hence of non-Catholic elements. These became automatically the greatest obstacle to the complete Catholicization of the new Croat State. Hence the adoption of a policy directed at the swift elimination of all the non-Catholic population.

Such a policy, coolly planned by Pavelich in concert with the Croatian hierarchy, was set in motion immediately the Nazis invaded Yugoslavia and was announced by responsible Croat leaders. Dr. Milovan Zanich, Dr. Mirko Puk, Dr. Victor Gutich, Croatian Ministers, unhesitatingly declared that the new Croatia would get rid of *all* the Serbs in its midst, in order to become one hundred per cent Catholic "within ten years." Dr. Mile Budak, Pavelich's Minister of Public Education and

Creeds, at a public meeting in Gospic, on July 22, 1941, officially confirmed the plan :

We shall kill one part of the Serbs [were his words], we shall transport another, and the rest of them will be forced to embrace the Roman Catholic religion. This last part will be absorbed by the Croatian elements.

The swiftest and most radical means to enact such a scheme: mass removal of Serbians from the contested zone. Of these, one-third would have been ejected to Serbia proper, one-third would have been "persuaded" to embrace Catholicism, and the rest would be "disposed of" by other means. "Persuasion" turned out to be forcible conversion, and "other means" biological extermination.

That spelt the total annihilation of the Orthodox Church, which, in fact, was the official policy of the new Catholic State of Croatia, put forward by the Croat Minister of Justice and Religion, Dr. Mirko Puk, who announced it in Parliament :

I shall also make reference to the so-called Serbian Orthodox Church [he said]. In this regard I must emphatically state that the Independent Croatian State cannot and will not recognize the Serbian Orthodox Church.¹²

The Croat Minister of Justice and Religion could well speak thus, for behind him was the Croat hierarchy. Typical of the spirit which at this time moved that hierarchy was the following, written by Father Petar Pajic, in the organ of the Archbishop of Sarajevo¹³ :

Until now, God spoke through papal encyclicals. . . . And? They closed their ears. . . . Now God has decided to use other methods. He will prepare missions. European missions. World missions. They will be upheld, not by priests, but by army commanders, led by Hitler. The sermons will be heard, with the help of cannons, machine guns, tanks, and bombers. The language of these sermons will be international. . . .

Was this mere rhetoric? It was the concrete basis upon which the Pavelich-Stepinac triple programme was made to operate simultaneously everywhere, following the establishment of the new State. Its implementation was a simple, direct, brutal affair, conducted under the shadow of Pavelich's Catholic storm-troops, the Ustashi. It ranged from simple decrees—like that issued by the Croat Minister of Public Instruction only four days after Hitler's attack (April 10, 1941),

which barred members of the Serbian Orthodox Church from entering the University *unless they had given up the Orthodox faith before April 10, 1941*—to wholesale deportations, like those carried out on July 4 and 5, 1941, by the Ustashi in Zagreb; to the massacre of men, women, and children, like that of Kljuch, on July 31, August 31, September 1 and 2, 1941, when the “Flying Ustashi” summarily executed approximately 2,000 Serbs.¹⁴ (*Please turn to this note now.*)

Mass deportations and mass executions, mainly in isolated small towns and villages, were well-planned operations.

In April, 1941, in the village of Gudovac, 200 Serb peasants were killed by the Ustashi, followed by larger groups in the villages of Stari Petrovac, in the district of Nova Gradisca, and in Glina. There, in the early days of May, 1941, Ustashi from Karlovci, Sisak, and Petrinja gathered together all males over fifteen years of age, drove them in trucks outside the town, and executed them all. In this district alone about 120,000 Serbs were thus exterminated within a short period.¹⁵

These horrors were not isolated instances. They were part of the well-calculated policy of the Government, which carried them out uninterruptedly, both in rural districts and in concentration camps erected for the purpose—e.g. at Jasenovac, Stara Gradiska, Gospic, where tens of thousands of Orthodox Serbs were exterminated.

As a rule, the procedure was a simple one. Ustashi authorities summoned groups of Serbs under the pretext of recruitment for military service or public works. Once rounded up, they were surrounded by detachments of armed Ustashi, taken outside the village, and executed. At times the rallying-point was a Serbian Orthodox church—e.g. in the town of Glina. In the mountainous regions of Upper Dalmatia, like Bosnia and Herzegovina, women and children were taken to remote spots and massacred. In Brcko, the home town of Dzafer Kulenovic, Deputy Prime Minister, the prisoners were executed on bridges and then dropped into the river. Often the executions were committed in the homes of the victims, with the most primitive weapons. Some Ustashi specialized in disposing of their charges by crushing their skulls with hatchets or even hammers. Incredible but authenticated atrocities were committed wherever the Ustashi

appeared. At Dubrovnik, Dalmatia, for instance, Italian soldiers took pictures of an Ustashi wearing two "necklaces." One was a string of cut-out eyes, the other of torn-out tongues of murdered Serbs.¹⁶

Some of the greatest horrors, curiously enough, were perpetrated by members of the intelligentsia. The most incredible case in this category is undoubtedly that of Peter Brzica. Peter Brzica was a law student, who had attended the Franciscan college at Siroki Brijeg, Herzegovina, a member of the Catholic organization of Krizari (the Crusaders). On the night of August 29, 1942, in the concentration camp at Jasenovac, orders were issued for executions. Those in charge made a bet as to who would dispose of the greatest number of prisoners. Peter Brzica cut the throats of 1,360 inmates with a special butcher's knife. He was declared the prizewinner of the competition, elected King of the Cut-Throats, and rewarded with a gold watch and a silver service, a roasted sucking-pig and wine. This astonishing depravity was reported by a doctor eyewitness who was in the camp when the event took place. His name: Dr. Nikola Kikolic, himself a Croat.¹⁷

Simultaneously with all this, the persecution of the Orthodox Church and forcible conversions were carried out with no-less-systematic ruthlessness.

Many of the Ustashi formations charged with such tasks were officered by Catholic priests and often friars, who had taken an oath to fight with dagger and gun for the "triumph of Christ and Croatia," and, indeed, some (e.g. Miroslav Filipovitch Majstorovich) even became commandants of concentration camps.

Catholic priests led the armed Ustashi in the closing of Orthodox churches and the confiscation of Orthodox records. At Banja Luka, for instance, an official order directed that all the Orthodox Church records of marriages, baptisms, burials, be delivered forthwith to Catholic parishes. Catholic priests took possession of the Serbian bishop's residence at Pakrac, and locked and sealed the cathedral (April 12, 1941).

Many Orthodox churches were converted into halls—e.g. that of Prnjavor, on July 10, 1941. Others were transformed into Catholic churches, when they were not pulled down altogether—e.g. in the provinces of Lika, Banija, and Kordun,

where 172 churches were totally destroyed. Most Orthodox monasteries shared the same fate. At Fruska Gora, fifteen Serbian Orthodox monasteries and churches were given to Catholic monks of the Franciscan order, as was also done with the Church properties at Orahovica, Pakrac, Lepavina, and other places.

The monastery of Vrdnik-Ravanica, wherein were buried the remains of King Lazar, who led and died in the historic battle of Kosovo against the Turks in 1389 in defence of Christianity, was also taken over, as was Sremski Karlovci, the former seat of the Orthodox Patriarchate. There the great cathedral was first plundered of all valuables, then closed, after all its physical properties had been taken over by the Catholic bishop.

Parallel with all this, a veritable race between Catholic bishops and priests to see who could convert most Orthodox to the "faith" began throughout Croatia. The spirit in which such a campaign was conducted can best be judged by a typical leaflet, issued in 1941, by the diocesan journal of Djakovo, which read :

The Lord Jesus Christ said that there shall be one pasture and one shepherd. Inhabitants of the Greek-Eastern faith, hear this friendly advice. . . . The Bishop of Djakovo has already received thousands of citizens in the Holy Catholic Church, and these citizens have received *certificates of honesty from State authorities*. Follow these brothers of yours, and report as soon as possible *for rechristening into the Catholic Church*.

With the example of the daily massacres before them, many followed this "friendly advice." Individual and mass conversions became a frequent occurrence. Most of the mass conversions were announced in the Croatian Press. *Katolički List*, organ of the Bishopric of Zagreb, controlled by Stepinac, in its issue No. 38 in 1941, for instance, reported that "the entire village of Budinci was rechristened to the Catholic Faith. A parish of over 2,300 souls was created in the village." The preparation for the rechristening was made by a Franciscan from Nasice, Father Sidonije Scholz.

Ustaska Velika Zupa No. 1372, of April 27, 1942, describes the mass conversions in the vicinity of Osijek, carried out by Father Peter Berkovic :

His work covers the period from preparation of the members of the Eastern Orthodox Church for conversion to Catholicism until they were actually converted, and thus in the counties of Vocin, Cacinci, and Ceralijie he converted more than 6,000 persons.

Ante Djuric, priest of Divusa, an Ustashi administrator, compelled all heads of families to come to their local teacher, with a ten-dollars tax stamp, to make out a petition for conversion to Catholicism for themselves and their families, with the alternative of having to forfeit their residence and posts.

The curate of Ogulin, Canon Ivan Mikan, charged 180 dinars for each forced conversion, so that in one Serb village alone, Jasenak, he collected 80,000 dinars.

A hint of how these mass conversions were carried out was given by *Nova Hrvatska*, an Ustashi paper, on February 25, 1942 :

The rechristening was carried out in a very solemn manner by the curate of Petrinja, Michael Razum. *An Ustashi company was present at this solemn occasion.*

The conversions, or rechristenings, as they were called, frequently were celebrated not only with water but also with blood. Priest Ivan Raguz, for instance, publicly urged the killing of all Serbs, including children, so that "even the seed of these beasts is not left," while curate Bozidar Brale, from Sarajevo, who took part in Serbian liquidation with gun in hand, advocated "liquidation of the Serbs without compromise." Brale was later appointed to the Presidency of the Spiritual Board of the Archbishop of Sarajevo.

These mass conversions were not only forced by fear or actual massacre, but also, as in Poland after the First World War, they were made easier by a calculated elimination of the Orthodox clergy. Hundreds of Orthodox priests, including bishops, were killed by the Ustashi.

On the night of June 5, 1941, on orders of the Ustashi chief, Gutic, the Orthodox Bishop of Banjaluka Platon, in Western Bosnia, together with several Orthodox priests, some of whom were former members of the House of Representatives, was taken to the outskirts of the town by the Ustashi. There the old bishop's beard was first torn out, a fire lit on his naked chest, then, after prolonged torture, he and all his companions

were killed with hatchets and their bodies thrown into the Vrbanja River.

Dositej, Orthodox Bishop of Zagreb, the capital of the Independent State of Croatia, where Archbishop Štepinac had his residence, lost his mind as a result of the tortures inflicted upon him before his execution. Two more Orthodox bishops, Peter Zimonjic of Sarajevo and Sava Trlajic of Plaski, were similarly murdered.¹⁸

Numerous Catholic priests and monks, some of them not even attached to the Ustashi formations, carried out executions with their own hands. The names of some of them have been put on record by the Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese of the U.S.A. and Canada.¹⁹

The result of such a policy was that whole families, entire villages, and even small towns embraced Catholicism during mass ceremonies performed by Ustashi priests, "watched" by armed units of the Ustashi, under the threat that, if they refused, they would be expelled. That meant that their property and their lives could not be guaranteed. Thousands were thus converted. After such mass conversions, the "new Catholics" had to go in procession to the local Catholic church, as a rule accompanied by units of armed Ustashi, singing about the happiness of having at last become the children of the true Church.

This was not all. In all the villages where Serbs had been "rechristened" the people were compelled by the Catholic priests to send congratulatory telegrams to Archbishop Štepinac, who was informed of every mass conversion performed in each parish throughout Croatia. Many of such telegrams were printed in the Ustashi paper, *Nova Hrvatska*, as well as in Štepinac's own official diocesan journal, *Katolički List*. In its issue of April 9, 1942, *Nova Hrvatska* printed four such telegrams, all addressed to Štepinac, in which mass conversions in villages were reported. One of these ran:

2,300 persons, assembled in Slatinski Drenovac, from the villages of Drenovac, Pusina, Kraskovic, Prekorecan, Miljani and Gjurisic, accepted today the protection of the Roman Catholic Church and send their profound greetings to their Head.

In this manner, within a brief period thirty per cent of

Orthodox Serbs residing in the New Croatia were converted to Catholicism.

Members of the Catholic hierarchy engaged on this type of proselytization, however, did not limit themselves to the use of fear of loss of property and even of life. Whenever resistance was encountered, they ordered and, indeed, themselves often carried out the execution of many of the most stubborn Orthodox. When collective resistance was met, collective punishment was inflicted, and this was often death.

A Jesuit priest, Dr. Dragutin Kamber, a sworn Ustashi, for instance, ordered the killing of about 300 Orthodox Serbs in Dobož, and 250 others to be court-martialled, most of whom were shot; while Father Dr. Branimir Zupanic, a personal friend of Ante Pavelich, had more than 400 men, women, and children killed in one village alone, Ragolje.

Father Srecko Peric, of the Gorica monastery near Livno, during one of his sermons in the Church of Gorica, advocated mass killings :

Kill all Serbs [were his words]. First of all, kill my sister, who is married to a Serb, and then all Serbs. When you finish this work, come here to the church and I will confess you and free you from sin.

There followed a massacre during which over 5,600 Orthodox Serbs lost their lives in the district of Livno alone (August 10, 1941).

The record, however, was reached by Miroslav Filipovic, an Ustashi since long before the War and a Franciscan monk. In the village of Drakulic the Friar killed a child with his own hands, at the same time addressing a unit of the Ustashi with the following words :

Ustashi, I rechristen these degenerates in the name of God. You follow my example.

The result of Monk Filipovic's example: 1,500 Orthodox Serbs were executed in one single day. Filipovic was made Commandant of Jasenovac, an Ustashi concentration camp which equalled Dachau in horror. In this capacity, Filipovic, in co-operation with Father Zvonko Brekalo, Zvonko Lipovac, and Father Culina, became responsible for the deaths of 40,000 men, women, and children, which took place in the camp during his rule.²⁰

Were these the actions of a few demented priests acting on their own initiative, blinded by religious mania, scornful of the authority of their Church, or disdainful of that of their head, Archbishop Stepinac?

The answer is in the negative.

The words and deeds of the Croatian hierarchy and, behind them, of the Vatican are the most eloquent proofs that Ustashi massacres were an integral part of a premeditated policy of total physical extermination of the non-Catholic population trapped within the confines of Catholic Croatia.

One of the most awful features of all violent commotions is that, even when inspired by ideals, they often set free the hidden beast lying, seemingly dormant, deep in the heart of man. Whenever anarchy is let loose, then the human brute, burning with passion, springs to the fore to make its most abominable dreams, nursed in the utmost secrecy for years, come true. Hidden phantasmagorias, repressed, thwarted, concealed through fear of either punishment, convention, or laws, shoot to the surface, provoking, like irresistible whirlwinds, such emotional devastation that often perfectly normal individuals are driven to commit deeds unimagined not only by others but even by themselves.

The mightiest provokers of such aberrations, in the past and in the present, have been religious and political fanaticism.

In Croatia, this, having been identified with Church, race, and State, was soon bound to twist the mental faculties of some individuals to a degree deemed impossible, and hence turn them into veritable human monsters, as was the case with many of them.

Catholic priests, being no less subject to passions than laymen, could not be exceptions because of their tonsures or cassocks. Whenever caught in the maelstrom, their ordinary faculties having been ousted, blind emotionalism induced them to commit the barbarities they did.

Owing to the innate frailty of human nature, to the irresistible power of religious fanaticism, these insane Croat Catholic clergy, therefore, should be regarded with pity and, indeed, compassion, rather than with execration.

No such leniency, however, can be entertained for those who calculatingly promoted such crimes. The flimsiest shred of mercy for the master-minds which calmly planned them and callously exploited the most abhorrent human passions to further religious and political designs would not be generosity, but approval of what they did, and hence perversion.

The Croatian terror was the offspring of such master-minds, identified mainly with personages apparelled in clerical garb. The terror had been coldly instigated from the silent archiepiscopal halls of the Croatian hierarchy. That hierarchy not only knew what was happening: it tacitly and overtly approved and, indeed, encouraged whoever was engaged in that most execrable work.

Violence advocated by priests, crimes ordered by priests and frequently committed personally by priests, were never condemned either by the bishops or by their leader, Mgr. Stepinac. Not a single member of the Catholic clergy was ever called to task while the Independent State of Croatia existed. Neither Archbishop Stepinac nor any other Church authority prohibited venomous writing, hate speeches, or even murders.

Priestly incitements to violence were written and published with the full approbation of the Croat bishops. No priest, it must be remembered, can write in the Press without specific episcopal permission. Canon Law is very clear on this: "Any priest who writes articles in daily papers or periodicals without permission of his own bishop contravenes Canon 1386 of the Code of Canon Law." Priestly incitements to violence were published in the ordinary Press without the bishops uttering a single word of reprimand. More than that, they were printed in the very ecclesiastical Press of the Croatian hierarchy. The meaning of that was too obvious to be misunderstood: the head of the Croatian hierarchy fully approved of them.

Archbishop Stepinac's responsibility is further enhanced by the fact that, in addition to having at his disposal canonical power, he could also use disciplinary authority. For, in addition to being Chairman of the Bishops' Conference, he was also Chairman of Catholic Action, and hence had supreme control over the writing of the entire Catholic Press. By invoking these powers Stepinac could have silenced any priest advocating the extermination of the Orthodox Serbs.

Nor was that all. For Stepinac, had he been truly willing, could have used civil power, being a fully-fledged Member of Parliament.

And, if that were not enough, to stop the crimes of his priests Stepinac was in a position to make use of military power. This in virtue of the fact that, at the beginning of 1942 and at the direct suggestion of the Vatican, he had been created Supreme Military Apostolic Vicar of the Croatian Army, being thus officially the highest military clergyman in Croatia. All priests attached to the Ustashi units—and these were usually the ones who either incited the soldiers to commit crimes or committed them themselves—were thus directly subordinated to him.

That the campaign of forcible conversion was supported by the Croatian hierarchy is further proved by the fact that forced conversion to Catholicism was made legal by governmental decree. This was issued by the Ustashi Prime Minister in June, 1941 (No. 11689), when an Office on Religious Affairs in charge of “all matters pertaining to questions connected with the conversion of the members of the Eastern Orthodox Church” came into being. The Croatian hierarchy made no protest, but, on the contrary, wholeheartedly supported the decree. It did more. It saw to it that the head of this new department was a priest, Father Dionizije Juricev, an intimate friend of Pavelich. It is also significant that such an office was set up following the very private audience which Pius XII had granted to Pavelich the previous month.

But nothing could better prove that the Catholic hierarchy had planned all this with the most cold-blooded calculation than their attitude towards the surviving Orthodox children who had escaped the biological extermination of their Orthodox parents. Under the auspices of *Caritas*, the Catholic organization run by the hierarchy, all these children were placed in public homes directed by Catholic priests or Catholic sisters, or, in many cases, with private Catholic families: this with the precise purpose of implanting into them “the true faith,” as a prerequisite of their bodies being saved. The process of speedy religious assimilation took place almost at once. Rebaptized with new Croatian names, officially converted to Catholicism, growing up in Catholic Croatian sur-

roundings, these children, having quickly lost all contact with their original ethnic and religious groups, were soon absorbed into the Catholic Church. The absorption was so complete that even after the collapse of Independent Croatia many could not be returned. Traces of their origin were very often wilfully made to disappear. A not-inconsiderable number were taken to Italy and even to the Argentine by fleeing Ustashi.

That the forcible conversions were directly instigated by the hierarchy was further demonstrated by the bishops themselves, who discussed, encouraged, and promoted them. One typical instance should suffice:

Dr. Simrak, former Apostolic Administrator and Bishop of Krizevci, issued a directive to all his clergy to that effect. It was published in the official *Bishopric News* of Krizevci, No. 2, 1942. The text, in part, reads as follows:

Directive regarding the conversion of the members of the Eastern Orthodox Church in Slavonia, Srijem, and Bosnia.

Special offices and church committees must be created immediately for those to be converted. . . . Let every curate remember that these are historic days for our missions and we must under no circumstances let this opportunity pass. . . . Now we must show with our work what we have been talking about for centuries in theory. We have done very little until now because . . . we are afraid of complaints from the people. Every great work has someone opposing it. Our universal mission, the salvation of souls and the greatest glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, is involved in this issue. Our work is *legal* because it is in accord with *official Vatican policy* and with the directives of the saintly congregations of the Cardinals for the Eastern Church.

Was this the isolated action of an enterprising bishop acting on his own, without the approval of his superiors? Indeed it was not. The Bishop of Krizevci was following the directives officially promulgated by the Primate of Croatia himself.

The year before, in fact—and precisely on November 17, 1941—Archbishop Stepanic, after having convened a Bishops' Conference in Zagreb, gave canonic sanction to the programme of forcible conversions. Result: the adoption of a programme which was officially followed by the entire Croatian hierarchy from that date.

The Bishops' Conference, in addition to promulgating such a policy, actually set up a Committee of three. Their task: to

solve the question of the forcible conversions, in conjunction with the Ustashi Minister of Justice and Religion. The Members of the Committee? The Apostolic Administrator, Dr. Janko Simrak, the Bishop of Senj, and Mgr. Stepinac, Archbishop of Zagreb.

Here are a few revealing clauses of the decree, which begins:

The Council of Croatian Bishops, at a conference held in Zagreb on the 17th day of December 1941, upon deliberations in regard to the conversion of Serbians of Orthodox faith to Roman Catholicism, promulgates the following decree:

1. Concerning the vital question of the conversion of those of Serbian Orthodox faith into Roman Catholicism, the Catholic Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, according to divine right and Church canons, retains sole and exclusive jurisdiction in issuing necessary prescriptions for said purpose, consequently, any action from any other but ecclesiastical authority, is excluded.
2. The Catholic Ecclesiastical Hierarchy has the exclusive right to nominate and appoint missionaries with the object of converting those of the Serbian Orthodox into the Catholic faith. Every missionary shall obtain permission for his spiritual work from the nearest local church authority. . . .
11. It is necessary that for conversions to be achieved, a *psychological basis* should be created among the Serbian Orthodox followers. With this object in view they should be guaranteed not only *civil rights*, but in particular they should be granted the right of *personal freedom* and also the right to *hold property*.²¹

Not content with this, the conference issued a complementary resolution (No. 253) in which further directions were given on the way in which the forcible conversions were to be carried out. If shorn of its official phraseology, the whole document would read more like an incredible declaration sprung from the remoteness of the most tenebrous days of the Dark Ages rather than factual directives adopted by a Catholic hierarchy in Europe in the middle of the twentieth century.

The monstrous promotion of it all, it should be noted, occurred with the tacit approval of the Vatican. It must be remembered that not a single priest could have taken part in the massacres or in the forcible conversions had the Vatican disapproved of them. A village curate can act only with the approval of his immediate superior, the bishop with that of his archbishop, the archbishop with that of the primate, the primate with that of the Vatican, and the Vatican with the personal approval of the Pope.

Pius XII was as responsible as, if not more than, Archbishop Stepinac himself. The Pope, it must be remembered, is the ultimate authority for all the hierarchies of the world. Policies of great import must be submitted personally to him before their implementation.

Croatia was a satellite of Nazi Germany. In 1940-1-2 the Vatican was on the most cordial terms with Hitler, the Nazi Ambassador there being treated at this period as a personage of far greater importance than the Allied diplomats. In addition to this, Croatian political and religious leaders came and went between Rome and Zagreb as freely as did the Germans and Italians themselves.

Pius XII, furthermore, knew about what was happening in Croatia, not only thanks to the hierarchical administrative machinery of the Catholic Church, which kept him extremely well informed of all Croatian events, but also because of additional, extra-reliable sources. Devout Ante Pavelich sent him regular reports about the progress of the Catholicization of the New Croatia, while Archbishop Stepinac himself supplied His Holiness with figures of the forcible conversions. In an official document, dated as late as May 8, 1944, His Eminence Archbishop Stepinac, head of the Croatian hierarchy, informed the Holy Father that to date "244,000 Orthodox Serbs" had been "converted to the Church of God."

While the most saintly Archbishop and the even more saintly Pope gave special thanks to Divine Providence for the fast-increasing number of the Croatian flock, protests at the forcible conversions and massacres began to mount as the first news leaked out.

The smiles of incredulity and the belief that they were anti-Catholic fabrications soon gave way to horror, with the result

that frantic appeals were sent, with increasing urgency, to Stepinac, Pius XII, and the Allies. Such appeals came from all quarters. Many were written by Catholic Croats, who cried their indignation directly to the Vatican or lodged horrified protests with Archbishop Stepinac. One of the most revealing is that sent to him by Prvislav Grizogono. Grizogono was a Minister of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia; more significant still, a Croat; and, even more ominous, a devout, honest Catholic. His words, therefore, had been carefully considered. Yet nothing could more eloquently indict his Church than his letter :

YOUR GRACE :

I write this to you as man to man, as a Christian to a Christian.

Since the first day of the Independent Croatian State, the Serbs have been massacred (Gospich, Gudovac, Bos, Krajina, etc.) and this massacring has continued to this day.

The writer then gives a long and detailed enumeration of the crimes committed. After which he concludes :

Why do I write this to you? Here is why: In all these unprecedented crimes, worse than pagan, our Catholic Church has also participated in two ways. First, a large number of priests, clerics, friars, and organized Catholic youth actively participated in all these crimes, but more terrible even Catholic priests became camp and group commanders, and as such ordered or tolerated the horrible tortures, murders, and massacres of a baptized people. None of this could have been done without the permission of their bishops, and if it was done, they should have been brought to the Ecclesiastical Court and unfrocked. Since this did not happen, then ostensibly the bishops gave their consent by acquiescence at least.

The Catholic Church has used all means to Catholicize forcefully the remaining Serbs. . . . The province of Srem is covered with the leaflets of Bishop Akshamovich, printed in his own printing shop at Djakovo. He calls upon the Serbs, through these leaflets, to save their lives and property, recommending the Catholic faith to them.

What will happen to us Croats if the impression is formed that we participated in all these crimes to the finish?

Again it is the duty of the Church to raise its voice; first, because it is a Church of Christ; second, because it is powerful.

I write to you this, about such terrible crimes, to save my soul, and I leave it to you to find a way to save yours.

Signed, PRVISLAV GRIZOGONO,

Former Minister of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.

At ZEMUM, February 8, 1942.

That was not all. Dr. Grizogono sent another letter to Dr. Ujchich, the Catholic Archbishop of Belgrade. In it he appealed to the Archbishop to ask the Pope to use his authority and to order the Croatian hierarchy to stop the massacres.

The Archbishop of Belgrade answered, saying that he had forwarded the appeal to the Vatican. In his reply to Dr. Grizogono the Archbishop wrote the following:

I thank you for your letter. The information about the massacres we have already received from many different sources. *I have forwarded everything to the Vatican*, and I believe that everything possible will be done.²²

Archbishop Stepinac, the head of the Croatian hierarchy, and Pope Pius XII, the head of the Universal Catholic Church, remained silent. Their silence cost the lives of 850,000 men, women, and children, massacred by Catholics with their tacit consent.

Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum—Such evil deeds could religion inspire.²³

For Archbishop Stepinac and for his master, Pius XII, unlike for some anguished honest Catholic Croats, however, the way to save one's soul remained as always the ruthless brandishing of the Catholic sword. This to further the dominion of Catholicism, not only where until then it had ruled supreme, in sealed Croatia, but also when, the tenebrous wings of Catholic terror having suddenly been lifted from that blood-soaked Catholic creature, the Independent Catholic State of Croatia tumbled at the thunderous tumbling of world Fascism.

But if the maddened Fascist dictators lay buried under their ruined edifice, the evil genius who had first inspired them—namely, the Vatican—to the sad astonishment of many, with the dawn of peace appeared riding by the side of the victors, a most evil omen for the coming peace.

Its vigorous promotion of a policy directed at revitalizing a moribund Fascism having promptly begun to reorientate European-American politics, the preservation of Catholic Croatia was bound to become one of its most immediate objectives.

In the early spring of 1945, when Nazi Germany—and consequently Croatia—had already begun to disintegrate, Pavelich and Stepinac, after consulting the Vatican, formulated and set out to promote a joint plan directed at the preservation of their model State. It consisted of: (a) impeding the Yugoslav Government from defeating the Fascist Croatian armies; (b) persuading the Allies to occupy Yugoslavia. This in order to prevent the Central Government from taking over Catholic Croatia.

Pavelich and Stepinac directed all their Catholic troops to resist and to fight at all costs the new Yugoslav Government, busily engaged in cleansing the country of the defeated German troops. At the same time they urged the Vatican to exercise pressure upon the Allies, with a view to having the whole of Yugoslavia occupied by Allied armies. Yugoslavia, it should be noted, had been one of the Allies herself since 1941.

A memorandum was submitted to the Supreme Allied Command for the Mediterranean, in which Pavelich and Stepinac asked for a swift Allied occupation. Civil war had broken out in the country, they said. The Allies must intervene. Contact of Croat troops with the Anglo-American armies had become an urgent necessity and, therefore, had to be made as soon as possible.

Not content with this, Stepinac strengthened his new policy with the official weight of the Church. On March 24, 1945, he summoned the Croat bishops to a conference. Result: a pastoral letter, in which, after due praise of Pavelich, their lordships the Croatian hierarchy violently attacked the Yugoslav National Liberation Movement and incited all Croats to fight, asking them to help the Ustashi armies, as the surest guarantors of the Independent State of Croatia.

To force all Catholics in this course, ten days before the final collapse Pavelich, after hurried consultations with the Papal Nuncio, passed on the reins of the Government to Archbishop Stepinac.

Stepinac, like Cardinal Mindszenty later, accepted, having banked upon the supposition that, once he became head of the State as well as head of the hierarchy, his joint spiritual and political power would be so powerful as not only to prevent

the disintegration of the tottering Croatia, but also to strengthen its fabric, and thus deal more efficaciously with both its external enemies and its allies.

Events, in the shape of the fast-advancing Yugoslav Army, overtook Stepinac and the resigning Fascist Croat Government. Within a few days Zagreb, the Croatian capital, was occupied. The Ustashi, after having entrusted to the care of Stepinac their important documents,²⁴ fled for their lives. Some were executed. Many escaped. Pavelich fled to Austria. There he was captured by the American forces near Salzburg, and made prisoner pending his official trial. After a while there was a "mysterious intervention"—subsequently known to have come from Pius XII, via the Salzburg archbishop. Pavelich was released, sent to Italy, and hid in the Vatican City. After a period among his purpled protectors he disguised himself as a monk and moved to an Italian monastery, where he lived unmolested under the false Spanish names of Pater Benarez and Pater Gomez. From there, having meanwhile been supplied with passport, money, and protection by Vatican authorities, he proceeded to the Argentine.

While Pavelich was peregrinating from episcopal, Papal, and monastic abodes, and Fascist war criminals were being tried and condemned everywhere, devastated Europe set out in earnest to prepare for peace.

Not so Archbishop Stepinac. His Croatian hierarchy and their political-military tools—namely, the Ustashi—set out in earnest to prepare for war, and turned into Catholic guerillas. Their war, fought no longer side by side with powerful Nazi armies, was going to be waged in the hills and woods of Croatia, through underground movements and secret organizations, as in olden times. Their new enemy: the Central Government of Federal Peoples' Republic of Yugoslavia, which had replaced the Yugoslav kingdom.

These scattered Ustashi groups hidden in the woods organized themselves and then established contact with Stepinac. Prominent among them: the former Ustashi Chief of Police, Colonel Erik Lisak, who, with the Archbishop's approbation, launched a programme of sabotage and of assassination of the officials of the new Yugoslav Republic.

The better to camouflage their new terroristic activities, the

organizers cloaked themselves once more in innocent-sounding religious designations. The old name of "The Crusaders" was adopted.

The ties between the Ustashi terrorists and the Church were so close that, soon after the clandestine meeting with the Ustashi Chief of Police, Stepinac summoned another Bishops' Conference in Zagreb (September 15, 1945). A pastoral letter drafted at the meeting was duly issued. The Yugoslav people were incited to rise against their new Government. Prior to this, a flag was consecrated to the Ustashi Crusaders' forces, in the chapel of the Archbishop. On November 8, 1945, Stepinac received an agent who brought from Salzburg the "Pledge of Ustashi Intellectuals" that they would fight on "for the liberation of the Croatian people."

These were no mere semi-academic forms of resistance. Stepinac took concrete steps. He directed priests and monks to act in liaison with terroristic groups—e.g. Father Mamerto Margetic, who travelled all over the country, keeping the illegal Crusader groups in communication with one another, reporting their numbers, position, equipment, and strength to Archbishop Stepinac in Zagreb. The latter, in his turn, passed such reports on to the Vatican, from where they were forwarded to the U.S. Government.

As subsequently with Cardinal Mindszenty, so also here, Stepinac and his Catholic terroristic bands based the success of their policy upon the timely intervention of the Allies. Such a hope was directly fed from the Vatican, from which quarter Stepinac received continual assurances that the Allies would soon help with military intervention. In the winter of 1945-6 the Ustashi underground units had no doubts about forthcoming outside help, the "fathers" (i.e. the Catholic priests attached to them) having given repeated assurances that the British and Americans would soon come to liquidate the existing Government. Archbishop Stepinac himself was so certain that "the peasants will one day rise" that he "*looked to the West to use its atomic power to impose Western civilization on Moscow and Belgrade, before it is too late.*"²⁵

When the War Crimes Commission produced indisputable evidence concerning Archbishop Stepinac's role in Pavelich's puppet Croatia, the Yugoslav Government, in order to avoid

stirring up a religious-political hornets' nest, asked the Vatican that Stepinac be withdrawn.

In October, 1945, the Vatican sent Bishop J. P. Hurley, of Florida, to Belgrade, to investigate, while acting as Apostolic Nuncio. His extensive reports to the Pope found their way into the Vatican's archives and were never made known. Pope Pius XII, the architect of the Vatican's post-War world strategy, had decided otherwise. As in the case of Poland, so now also in that of Yugoslavia, individual welfare had to be sacrificed to the requirements of Vatican diplomacy.²⁶ Stepinac was ordered by the Pope to refuse to leave and to await his arrest.²⁷

The inevitable happened, and on September 18, 1946, Stepinac was arrested. After a ten days' hearing in the presence of the world Press, the Court—where all officials in the trial were Croatian Catholics—sentenced him, on October 11, to sixteen years' imprisonment.

The Vatican excommunicated all who had taken part in the trial, which was promptly depicted as the most appalling persecution of religion. Stepinac, the politician, the plotter, the authoritarian leader, became Stepinac the martyr, the holy priest, the saintly democrat. The world Press, religious and political leaders, and even Foreign Offices, including those of England and the U.S.A., formally protested against such "unheard-of religious persecution." Many Protestant denominations came to the fore to defend "the martyr" Stepinac, who had challenged the forces of evil in order to protect religious freedom. A wave of sympathy and support for the Catholic Church swept the Western world.

The Stepinac "martyrdom" soon yielded its first crop of political dividends.

The Cold War, which had just begun, received a further impetus. The emotional hatred fostered by the trial accelerated ideological odium throughout the West. Grand-scale rearmament found another justification. The U.S.A., which by 1946, only one year after the fall of Hitler, had already spent almost one billion dollars in stockpiling,²⁸ accelerated its war preparations. The American war factories began to hum again; their Russian counterparts were expanded. By the time that Archbishop Stepinac, through one

of the most shameless examples of American-Vatican dollar blackmail technique,²⁰ was prematurely set free (December, 1951), the world had already been politically and militarily split asunder. The U.S.A., the "defender of Christian civilization," had become the arsenal of the West; Soviet Russia the arsenal of the East.

Everywhere armies which had just been disbanded reassembled, ready to march. The raucous voices of former war leaders and of would-be war leaders spoke of the approaching third World War, statesmen asked for "preventive" atomic attacks, and nations went bankrupt, ruined by a gigantic armaments race.

Unctuous slogans from Vatican Hill, calling for a holy war to save a most unholy peace, mingled ever more boldly with the hypocritical voice of a Pope appealing to human brotherhood on sundry Christmas Eves, while feverishly engaged throughout the remainder of the year with plotting for the destruction of whole nations, just because they did not share the Papal religious or even ideological tenets.

One day, above the clamour and din of a world preparing for yet another global holocaust, strange voices began to be heard, at first feebly, but then ever more loudly. The voices had a most uncannily familiar ring. Many people shuddered. Were these not the voices of the most Catholic terroristic bands of the Ustashi?

They were. For truly the Ustashi, seemingly dispersed for ever, were not dead. Screened, protected, and promoted by the Vatican, they had once more joined the anti-Bolshevik chorus, shouting ever more boisterously with those who were shouting for a new war, that they, too, the Catholic Ustashi, wanted to fight "against the foe of freedom" when "the time arrives."

These were not the words of lonely members of the Pavelich-Stepinac bands in exile. It was the collective voice, the official declaration of the Supreme Command of terroristic Croat bands, significantly enough reorganized in the U.S.A. Former Ustashi were not to join foreign armies, said the declaration. They had to wait, as they would fight again under the Croatian flag and within new Croatian formations:

Headquarters of the V. Assembly of Croatian Armed Forces, having jurisdiction over all subjects of the Croatian Armed Forces (Hr or Sn) living on the territory of the European States.

It has been learned that some persons, unauthorized, are endeavouring to persuade individuals to enlist in foreign armies. By the order of the Supreme Command of all Croatian Armed Forces, all subjects living in any European state be notified that no individual person is authorized for such activity, nor is it permitted enlisting in foreign armies in any capacity, without a special authorized permit. The Supreme Command of all the Croatian Armed Forces will call its forces to arm against Bolshevism when the time arrives to fight side by side with other anti-Communistic nations, under our own flag and within our Croatian army formations.

Headquarters V. Assembly,
GENERAL DRINYANIN.

*August, 1950.*³⁰

To many these were bold words, the words of a man wanting freedom to prevail on earth. At the Vatican and at the American State Department, however, they knew better. For General Drinyanin was none less than one Maks Luburich, former Chief Commandant of all the Concentration Camps of Catholic Croatia, the leader of the terrible "Ustashi Defence," who massacred 200,000 persons in the camps of Yasenovatz, and, last but not least, the political "protector" of all those engaged in the forcible conversions to Catholicism during the brief existence of the Croatian State.

The following year, 1951, Ante Pavelic, having set up headquarters in super-Catholic Argentina, helped by Catholic priests and friars and blessed by the Vatican, established a new *Ustashi Government*, and "eagerly" waited for the outbreak of the third World War to bring "freedom" to Croatia.

To such depths had the word "freedom" been made to sink.

And yet the clarion call of General Drinyanin was no more blasphemous than the clarion calls of some gigantic violators of freedom whose slightest bidding can throw whole continents into fear.

Or, indeed, of whole nations in the East and in the West, preparing to extinguish freedom in the name of a freedom purposely disfigured by perverse economic or ideological dogmas, the better to enslave ever-larger portions of the human race.

But if powerful political units like the U.S.A. and Soviet

Russia have fearsomely distorted the genuine significance of true freedom, through either ideological odium, the unbearable weight of armaments, endemic mistrust, reciprocal fears, or the sum of all these, behind their thunderous war preparations there is lurking, silent and undetected, that most ancient and implacable maimer of freedom: the Catholic Church.

To such a monster, freedom, as dreamt of by modern man, is an evil, to be destroyed with unearthly passion. For to her the whole globe must be filled with one single freedom: the freedom to enforce herself upon the human race.

All her tenets, all her deeds—as our cursory exposition should have demonstrated—prove that the Catholic Church, now perhaps more than ever in the past, is resolutely engaged in such a villainous pursuit.

Her stupendous emergence as a global power bespeaks her successful ascent; more, it is an omen, unmistakably portending that she has already become a most fearsome threat to the freedom of the whole world.

The dark wings of her terror, although encircling the skies of the future, have begun to beat in the present, and are already hovering over a large portion of the surface of the earth.

Were the Western nations to let themselves be adumbrated for too long by their lengthening shadow, then genuine freedom would swiftly be replaced by “Catholic freedom.”

“Catholic freedom” would spell one thing: the prompt transformation of both the European and the American continents into two gigantic hemispheric Croatias, where the lights of liberty would be made to shine no longer. In such a world the deadly past would come to rule the present. A present in which the Catholic Church could librate herself like a most abominable bird of prey feasting upon the corpse of that freedom, empurpled so often by blood, sung so many times by the poets, dreamt with so many tears by the poor; of that same freedom which all men of goodwill had so stubbornly hoped one day might bless the mankind of a truly peaceful and united world.

CONCLUSION

THE WILL FOR WORLD DOMINION HAS caused prophets and armies, conquerors and dreamers, to march with the strides of those who rise up on the horizon to tear asunder the stars of the firmament.

Moses and Mahomet, Cæsar and Attila, the Aryans, the Mongols, all made the past echo with the lamentations of multitudes rent by their swords partitioning the Universe, hailed and cursed throughout the millennia during their unceasing attempt to enchain mankind, to master the globe.

World wars have already shaken the earth; world wars are about to shake it again, with monstrous new commotions. Frightening, growing terror is stalking in the present. Unfathomable, unknown terror is looming from the future. Terror and more terror has surged everywhere. Verily, such magnitudinous portents are sent forth in the skies only prior to the thunderous fall of a world.

Roaming in the twilight of cultures approaching extinction, formidable military despotisms are wandering abroad like monstrous reptiles, while conquerors whose bulk has darkened the continents are deafening the skies with their trumpeting, to force the human race into a submission to avoid which countless generations soaked our planet in blood.

One of these, the Catholic Church, notwithstanding all the

political disasters that have befallen her and the innumerable occasions on which she was stultified before mankind, has stepped once more to the forefront with those who are conspiring against the liberty of the world. Although in the storm and stress of conflict with the twentieth century she has again erected her pennants, as incorrigible and as irrepressible as ever, and distributed her chief forces throughout the earth in a most determined attempt to subjugate all men. To reach such a goal she will suffer no obstacles, be deterred by no barriers, put up with no enemies, tolerate no rivals, competitors, or even friends.

Monsters who, like her, were found preying in the deep valleys of history, she fought with bloody claws. Many she led to their destruction, others she dwarfed or subjugated for good. To rule supreme above all, she fought on battlefields, embracing whole nations, with a ferociousness whose echoes have resounded with other most sanguinary echoes along the ageless corridors of the ancient and recent past.

Whenever the voice of liberty flung its challenge into centuries which were better acquainted with the accents of subservience, then she invariably struck with all her might of superstition, religion, and physical terror.

To intimidate, to curb, to silence, and to destroy, she never hesitated to suppress, to persecute, to boycott, and to burn. Many of the great upheavals directed against freedom were conceived, inspired, or promoted by her: the Crusades of the Middle Ages, the wars against the Turks, the wars against the Protestants, the wars against the French and American revolutions, the war against Liberalism yesterday, the war against Democracy today.

To further her dominion she engineered—and now she is engineering more feverishly than ever—villainous conspiracies, encouraged bellicose nationalisms, supported political monstrosities, and blessed immense war machines, employing religious prejudice, social grievances, economic inequalities, national divisions, racial hatred, and ideological odium. To enhance her authority she is forming alliances with anyone ready to help her, making friends with the enemies of yesterday, and enemies tomorrow of the friends of today; promoting rebellions, revolutions, and wars, and inspiring gigantic hatred

with such vulpine slyness as successfully to deceive all and sundry: this the better to deprive individuals, States, and, indeed, whole continents of their liberty.

Today, grown in size, might, and numbers, without peer in either experience or malignity, she has appeared before the astonished nations, energized through 10,000 instruments of power and influence, vitalized by a ruthless coercion, riveted upon hosts of prelates, clergy, and an army 400,000,000 strong, drilled and disciplined by a system which regards as primary, not freedom, but submission. The better to deceive, cajole, and awe the masses, she has surrounded herself with a supernatural aura, apparelled with all the prestige of antiquity, the political truculence of a conspiratorial monster, invigorated by an enormous accumulation of wealth, tremendous hidden influence, an organization perfected under a process of centralization without equal, supported by the colossal industrial and military power of ruthless friends, strengthened by the fear of an immense hostile ideology that has mobilized half the world to her side and which has transformed her into the most powerful engine of spiritual aggression the world has ever seen.

Every one of her movements bears the marks of the most savage determination to dwarf the individual, so as ultimately to despoil him of all his liberties: the liberty to think, to inquire, and to rebel. When within her fold, contemporary man cannot question, doubt, or object. If she gives a decision, it is impertinent for him to ask whether his conscience can approve of it. If she decrees some dogma, it is revolutionary for him to ask if her revelation has any basis of truth. Although striving to justify herself in the face of science, free inquiry for him is anathematized. All his social, economic, and ideological exertions must be co-ordinated by her sectarian dogmatism. The established order hailed by her must be hailed also by him. His intellectual research, unless conforming to her exclusive orthodoxy, is suppressed and, indeed, curtailed. Resistance is met with excommunication. Emphasis upon blind obedience at the expense of freedom is riveted upon him from birth to death. Intellectual torpor is commended to him as the chief Catholic virtue. The promotion of the miraculous, belief in the incredible, and the acceptance of the impossible

are given precedence over his reason. The absurd arguments of a stridently debased and vindictive theology are relentlessly used to blunt the logical faculties of his intellect. His fantasies are harnessed by a rage for sensuous worship, gorgeous rites, imposing services, incantations, pomp, superstition, and sundry hoary bigotries which her meddlesome sacerdotalism dispenses with such amplitudinous generosity to the gullible Catholic masses.

Such monstrous despotism she is determined equally to enforce upon non-Catholics. The ultimate objective of her mission being total conquest of the human race, the purpose of her dominion is total annihilation of world freedom. In a Catholic-dominated world Protestants, Moslems, Buddhists, Shintoists, Hindus, and other religions would therefore be made to vanish. [Social, political, ideological, philosophical tenets, systems or doctrines, theoretical and applied science, not in harmony with hers, would be extinguished.]

The effects of such universal illiberality would be so profound as to alter civilization. [Science would have to be adulterated—for instance, to sustain the Papal revelation that a Palestinian woman ascended into the stratosphere and is alive now as at the time of Cæsar Augustus.] Nuclear physics would have to be drastically revised, to prove that the sun can be made to swing, zigzag, or swirl at a simple *Hail Mary*, to gratify either the asinine vanity of some papal *hominid* walking in the Vatican gardens or, more precisely, to promote the felonious political plans of insidious ecclesiastic schemers set on blunting the intellectual faculties of the human race by mass superstition, to soften its resistance to Catholic assault. To disobey, to doubt, to dissent, to whisper derision or incredulity or to show merriment would be to invoke Catholic ire, boycott, persecution, and extermination. Behold Croatia!

In such a society freedom would perish for ever.

Catholic exertions, as scrutinized in this book, bespeak that she has converted herself into a most powerful engine of spiritual aggression, *to subvert the present, in order to conquer the future, there to implant the past* in the shape of a world Catholic domination.

If a Church-State is to be more dreaded as a foe of liberty than the State itself, a global Catholic Church-State is to be

dreaded a thousandfold more than the most formidable of the abominable despotisms of the twentieth century.

The banners of the Catholic Church have never been on the side of the people, nor her standard on the side of freedom.

Yet Catholic machinations are hailed by individuals and by nations claiming to have at heart the freedom of the world. Among these, her sword unsheathed, is the United States of America.

If world liberty is imperilled by economic or ideological world Imperialisms, it is no less threatened by world Catholicism. The most perilous foes are not those openly branded as such, but those who, while posing as allies, cravenly scheme their own advancement upon the ruins of enemies and friends alike.

The Catholic Church has never been, and will never be, a friend of the U.S.A. She is not her friend, being *secretly* bent upon her destruction with the same malevolent determination with which she is *openly* bent upon that of Communist Russia.

The ineradicable teaching of the Catholic Church is that whoever is not wholly Catholic is *ipso facto* her enemy. In her eyes, therefore, a Protestant democratic U.S.A. is basically as much of a foe as an Orthodox Communist Russia, and hence ultimately, like her, to be removed.

The fact that both have been earmarked for destruction does not, however, signify that this must be simultaneous, or that it ought to be accomplished by the same devices. Following her ancient practice, which is the fundamental tenet of her grand strategy, the Catholic Church has allied herself with the less dangerous of her foes in order, with its aid, to destroy the more formidable.

Destruction of one enemy with the help of another derives just from the timely implementation of such tactical cunning. The key to her alliance with the U.S.A. lies precisely in that, and can be summarized in the formula: conquest of Soviet Russia via the American sword; conquest of Protestant U.S.A. via the Catholic sword—namely, via a swift, belligerent Catholicization of the American people.

As the conquest of the first depends upon the help of the second, Catholic assault against Protestant U.S.A. will be made

after Protestant U.S.A. has destroyed Soviet Russia. Russian destruction means American physical conquest. This spells a third World War. [The Catholic great onslaught against the U.S.A., therefore, will be launched after World War III.]

The spiritual conquest of the U.S.A., however, will be initiated long before then. Indeed, if, as the result of another global war, the weakening of the U.S.A. comes up to Catholic expectations, then Catholic conquest will be carried out with equal eagerness in the atomized American cities as well as in the depopulated Russian plains. A post-War world would thus find the Catholic Church engaged in a gigantic simultaneous Catholicization of her two most dangerous rivals for world dominion: ex-enemy, formerly Soviet Russia, and ex-friend, formerly democratic U.S.A.

The preparatory moves to such a vicious strategy are in operation *now*. The cult of Fatima, with its duel tenet of total Communist extermination plus Russian Catholicization, parallel with a spectacular Catholic penetration of the U.S.A., are the inseparable complements of the Catholic grand policy of today. The completion of such a policy depends upon simultaneous abnormal commotions imperilling the equilibrium of both Russia and the U.S.A.—namely, it depends upon war.

Such a strategy was first implemented with the opening of the age of the global conflicts, and has borne always the same nefarious fruits: war, the destruction of the nations whom the Catholic Church had *befriended*, a new expansion of an invigorated Catholic power, and the emergence of ever-more-robust foes of freedom, trusting in Catholic protection, support, and promotion.

During the First World War, Catholicism sided with those two most odious haters of liberty, the Austrian and German Emperors. [Out of the chaos of the First World War there emerged Fascism. The fact that Fascism, one of the Church's pet creatures, sprang first from the very seat of Catholicism was no mere coincidence. The original Fascist leaders were Catholic-born, or Catholic-educated: Mussolini in Italy, Hitler in Germany, Franco in Spain, Dolfuss in Austria, Petain in France, Degrelle in Belgium, Tiso in Slovakia, Pavelich in Yugoslavia, Pilsudski in Poland, Quisling in Norway,¹ not to

mention the Catholic operetta-dictators of the Latin-American republics, still the most inglorious by-products of Catholic cultural poisoning in otherwise basically democratic lands. These individuals, infected by Catholic bacilli from their infancy, attempted, all of them, to kill democracy in order to extinguish freedom.

During the Second World War, the Catholic Church supported those two even greater enemies of freedom, Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. Out of the chaos of the Second World War there originated the greatest hate-mobilization ever seen. Result: the re-emergence of Fascism, apparelled in democratic guise; the disastrous rearming of East and West; the split of the world into two.

The fate of Catholicism's new ally will be that of all its past allies, even if militarily victorious: defeat. The Germany of the First World War, whom it befriended, fought and tumbled. The Germany of the Second World War, whom it supported, fought and tumbled. But, while they tumbled to their doom, their associate, the Catholic Church, not only never fought and never tumbled, she sprang out of their ruins, a victor.

Following the chaos of the First World War, Catholicism grew into a paramount European Power, and turned promptly into the supporter of Fascism. Following the chaos of the Second World War, it developed into the greatest ideological power in the West and the most eager supporter of the U.S.A. Following the chaos of a third World War, Catholicism reckons to rise out of the incinerated Russian, European, and American cities as the unchallenged ruler of a ruined world. Such a perverse scheme may yet come true. *No! "Amv"*

The destruction of the Communist nations, with the simultaneous Catholic penetration of the U.S.A., would permit the Catholic Church to dominate the American and European continents. That, in its turn, would enable her to thrust her iron heel throughout the West. The First and Second World Wars have already implemented a great deal of such designs. The third World War, in her calculations, should put the final seal on their completion.

The belief that if Catholicism's friendship in the past spelt the ruin of all those whom it befriended, it will not spell the

ruin of a democracy like the U.S.A. is dangerous. Catholicism's friendship has already steered the U.S.A. along the path to perdition. Since the consummation of the Catholic-American honeymoon, domestic authoritarianism and military expansionism have sprung with telluric suddenness before a stunned America. These, having promptly imperilled the basic liberties of the American citizen, have stultified the smooth working of American democracy, thus endangering, in addition to the freedom of the American masses, that of all the nations of the West.

As in the cases of the Central Powers during the First World War and Nazi Europe during the Second, the Catholic Church, by encouraging the internal authoritarianism and external expansionism of the U.S.A., has contributed—perhaps even more than the invisible government of the billionaire corporations themselves, and the genuine or alleged expansionistic designs of Soviet Russia—to drive the two most formidable hostile combatants of the century to make ready for a reciprocal kill, and thus to push the American people into the abyss of a third World War.

The reason which has prompted her to help push the U.S.A. and the West towards the precipice is closely inter-connected with the pursuance of her ultimate goal. A third World War, by spelling the collapse of nations, great and small, including Soviet Russia and the U.S.A., would permit her to extend her dominion over the Western masses, whether Catholic or not.

That has been the key to all her machinations, the waxing and waning of her influence, her defeats and her successes, since the opening of the century. The ruthlessness of such a policy, the immorality of her tactics, and the criminality of her designs are not exceptional devices to meet exceptional situations. They are as traditionally Catholic as Catholicism itself. Their use in the present is in harmony with their use in the past. Catholic schemes have always necessitated recurring corruption, destruction, and decay. By her very nature the Catholic Church feeds upon the blood of the dead, and, like a veritable vampire, also upon that of the living. She cannot expand unless she grows upon the corpses of her enemies and is invigorated by sapping the strength of her

friends, all of whom she has invariably lured to their destruction.

History has often proved that whoever became her ally perished: the Portugal of the friars and navigators, the Spain of the Armada, the France of Napoleon III, the Germany of the Kaiser, the Europe of the Fascist dictators. Unless retrieved in time, the U.S.A. will succumb like her predecessors. Her weakening would spell not only the ruin of a great nation, but something more ominous: the weakening of the West. The Catholic Church's long-range policy lies precisely there; for, without an enfeebled West, her most ambitious design would be hampered and retarded, if not altogether nullified.

It is the implementation of the latter which has prompted her to pursue a plan of spectacular acquisition of political power, based upon the weakening of Europe following each successive war. Her efforts have met with astounding success. Her influence grew by leaps and bounds following the chaos of the First World War. It grew a hundredfold after the chaos of the Second. It will be magnified a thousandfold more after the chaos of World War III. It will become immense after the collapse of the West. Such are her calculations.

Her strategy is based on a tremendous precedent. Following the chaos resulting from the disintegration of the Roman Empire she was able, by a mixture of skilful political manoeuvring, religious penetration, and sheer villainy, to saddle Europe with a dominion which she managed to maintain throughout the Middle Ages, via spiritual terror, anathema, curses, fulminations, and the swords of her Popes.

She is about to repeat the process now. The weakening of the West is not an objective in itself. It is meant to hasten Catholic conquest, via a Catholic-dominated West serving her as a formidable tool of world aggression. For with it under her heel she reckons to become the veritable arbiter of the destiny of the human race.

Fantastic speculations? These are the concrete schemes of a turbulent ecclesiastical Imperialism, faced by concrete situations, promoting concrete policies to achieve concrete goals, and ready, in order to achieve them, to drench mankind in welters of blood. This cannot be otherwise. The Catholic

Church, it must never be forgotten, is neither a religion, nor a Church, nor a spiritual ally of contemporary man, but a Cimmerian monster, rooted in the darkness of bygone ages, making ready to swoop with deliberate vampiric deadliness upon the moribund Western nations, to prey with vulturine greed upon their corpses, as she did following the tumbling of the Roman world.

Unlike the first centuries of the second millennium, however, those of the third will see, not her triumph, but her collapse.

Her future, as always, has been planned on the pattern of the past. New factors of imponderable magnitude, newness, and potency, however, from now on will see that the past shall no longer be permitted to repeat itself: science; the shrinking of the continents; the telescoping of races, cultures, and civilizations; the re-emergence of rival world religions; and, above all, the three most formidable phenomena of the twentieth century—Communism, the atom, and the growing will of mankind to extirpate, uproot, and, indeed, annihilate all the great reptiles. These one day will swiftly obliterate the past that the present may precede a truly noble future. Catholic power, then, shall be broken, stamped out, and extinguished.

Misery, ruin, blood, terror, and death are the sires of revolutions. Wars are the provokers of revolutions. Revolutions today mean Communism. World wars, by provoking world revolutions, therefore, will further world Communism. A third World War might destroy Communist nations; it will not destroy Communism.

Communism is the universal reaction against a universal rapacity of the few. And, while it is true that it is the offspring of all the disinherited of the earth revolting against a systematized profiteering in human misery, it is no less true that it was first given birth by one world war and nursed into manhood by a second.

Out of the First World War there surged the Bolshevik Revolution, and Communist Russia came into being. Out of the Second World War there surged European and Asiatic revolutions, and Communist Eastern Europe, with its 100,000,000 people, and Communist China, with its

500,000,000, came to the fore. Out of the third World War there will surge Western European, Asiatic, and African revolutions, and from them Communist Europe, Asia, and Africa. These will spell a Communist American continent, and therefore ultimately a Communist world.

In this way the atom, which in the reckoning of Catholicism and its allies should be the final annihilator of world Communism, would have become the promoter of a global revolution. A violent global revolution would drench mankind in a global blood-bath.

Could the American people, that most noble new race in the making, once the most vigorous advocates of liberty, permit the imperilling of their destiny to further Catholic designs?

Could the Western nations let their cities and their monuments, the inheritance of the culture of two millennia, be swept away by a whirlwind which would endanger the very existence of the white race, to implement the monstrous dreams of the Catholic Church?

Could the teeming multitudes of Africa and of Asia, after the atomization of their continents, allow Catholic Imperialism, that most savage supporter of White predatoriness, go once more unpunished?

Mankind has stumbled into the Atomic Age. The atom will conquer the world. The conquerors of the atom will conquer world freedom. The ancient great reptiles are out to conquer both, to enchain humanity with unbreakable chains.

This they will do by unloosing a third World War.

But if revolutions are the devourers of their own children, wars are the destroyers of their own promoters. Out of another world holocaust there will surge such a mighty harvest of avengers that not a single one of those monsters who dared to drench a whole century with blood in their attempts to destroy religion in the name of religion, freedom in the name of freedom, and man in the name of man, shall meet with mercy or with pity on the day when the assembled nations shall sit in solemn judgment against them.

For truly, if the fecundity of hate breeding hate is enough to dethrone reason, the incineration of the continents will

explode, once and for all, the great illusion of the ancient dragons that man is born to be slave.

The great reptiles of the past will then be scattered for good to the winds, that their bones be counted like pebbles in the detritus of a great deluge. Catholic Imperialism, sired by myths beyond counting, will perish with all the other monsters who turned the astounding progress of an astounding century into an hallucinatory age tormented by three World Wars, with all the terrors of their vigils and all the terrors of their aftermaths.

The horizon of world history, heavy with the huge billowing clouds of oncoming prodigious hurricanes, is resounding with ever-more-violent muttering, the echoes of ancient battling, the horror of global conflicts, and the growing despair of nations.

The swift approaching rumblings of Cimmerian powers having wrapped the whole world in fear, are now portending once again world devastation without end.

Catholic arrogance will be humbled, and its granitic imperiousness will be turned to dust by the great whirlwind which is about to shake the earth. Under the incubus of atomic incineration as the alternative to progress, man will strangle his stranglers.

The atom has already rocked to its foundations the very world which they are so determined to preserve. Such a world is tumbling. The West is decaying. Africa is stirring. Asia is on the march. The old massive stability of the continents has gone, never to return. From the East, a monster sired by the atavistic greed of the White Race has, more ominously than even the first atomic explosion, mushroomed high in the sky, portending the prodigy of the shape of things to come. Wandering under the crepuscular peace of an atomic global massacre, the surviving dragons of the past are tramping the earth, determined to annihilate the moribund peace of a moribund world. Their exertions will be vain. For truly the age of the great reptiles is about to end. The world of predatory giants, whose bulk has blotted out the stars of world liberty for so long, is plunging to its doom.

All giants and great reptiles are freaks; Nature abhors them. Whenever they appear she has seen that they bear within

themselves the germs of their own destruction, that the earth be shaken by their tumultuous downfall, as a warning that whoever violates her is doomed to extinction.

The unrepentant violators of human freedom, who, like evil comets reddened with blood, have hurtled across the sky of the twentieth century, leaving in their trail aggressions and revolutions, wars, and terror, will be made to plunge from the firmament with such a roaring crash that the very memory of their names will call upon them the universal execration of mankind in all the centuries to come.

That most formidable breeder of monsters, the Catholic Church, will be made to tumble with the greatest ignominy of all by the tide of her past misdeeds recoiling upon her, as irresistible as the waters of the great flood. The blood of the unjustly slain, which has flowed like an ever-widening river through the sombre valleys of history, has already run too deep for man to suffer any longer the earth to be empurpled with it anew.

The fixed star of the Catholic Church shall fall from the sky of the West with thunder. For the bell of destiny, which has tolled for all tyrants, verily is about to toll also for her.

Backward the march of men can never go. A calamitous present is gliding irresistibly away from the past towards a future of regions without maps, where the captive aspirations for those vast liberties for which contemporary man is clamouring, for himself and for his descendants, shall sparkle like gems in all the glory of the oncoming spiritual confederation of the globe.

In such a world all the multitudes who died for them will scintillate in the firmament of history like distant suns, enthroned in wondrous splendour, while mankind, recalling the scattering of prophets who, from the world of the past, cried for the world of the future, shall remember, in tenderness and in wonder, all those who, during the twentieth century, kept the torch of liberty alive that future generations might see, without tears and without blood, the fulfilment of that noblest of all dreams: the freedom of the world.

NOTES

3

- 1 Cardinal Bellarmine. *Bellarmin. De Rom. Pontif.* L.4. C.5. Para. ult. cited in the *Salter's Hall Lectures*.
- 2 Gratian. Decret. P.I. Dist. 40 can. 6. This was one of the canons which, it is believed, prompted Luther to burn the Canon Law publicly at Wittenberg in 1520.
- 3 Thomas à Becket. *S. Thomæ Cantuar.* Epist. 73.
- 4 *Papa regit reges, dominos dominatur, acerbis Principibus stabili jure jubere jubet.* Matthew of Vendôme. *Matt. Vindocineus.* Commendat. Papæ (Migne, *Patros* T. 205, p. 980).
- 5 Geoffrey of Vinsauf, in his address to Innocent III:
*Non Deus es, nec homo; sed neuter et inter utrumque,
Quem Deus elegit socium; socialiter egit
Te cum partitus mundum, sibi noluit unus
Omnia, sed voluit tibi terras et sibi coelum.*
Hurter, *Hist. du Pape Innocent III*, Paris 1840, II., p. 68.
- 6 *Papa non homo simpliciter sed quasi deus in terris est.*
To quote only one characteristic case. In 1335 Bishop Alvarez Pelayo laid down the doctrine that as Christ partook of the nature of God and man, so the Pope as His vicar participates with Him in the divine nature as to spiritual things, and in the nature of man as to temporal matters, so that he is not simply a man, but rather a God on earth. *Ejusd.* Lib. I. Art. 68, No. J. (Fol. lixix.).
- 7 Cardinal Du Perron, who concluded a letter to Pope Clement VII, from which the above quotation is taken, with the words: "I have always revered your beatitude as God on Earth."
- 8 Innocent P.P. III. *Serm. iii. in Consecrat.*
- 9 *Esaminatore, Florence*, 1.7.1867, p. 790.
- 10 *Papa est omnia et super omnia . . . potest mutare quadrata rotundis.* See *Esaminatore, Florence*, 1.7.1867, p. 190, p. 378 cen.
- 11 Pius XII, 20.2.49, in an address to the crowd in St. Peter's Square.
- 12 Cardinal Bellarmine *Opera*, Tom. I. De Romano Pontifice, L.v. C.i. Col. 887. A. Coloniae, 1620, cited in Stamp's edition of Elliott's *Delineations of Romanism*, p. 707.
- 13 Innocent IV.
- 14 Gregory VII.
- 15 In his *Pastoralis*, of March, 1314, to King Henry VII, of Naples.
- 16 Bull: *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, by Pope Paul IV.
- 17 The Papal grant, made in 1055, was kept a secret until after Henry landed in Ireland in 1172. The conquest of Ireland, ordered by Pope Hadrian IV, is authenticated by a document called the Bull *Laudabiliter*, to be found in the Roman Bullarium (1739).
- 18 Of the Pope's Bull made to Castille, touching the New World. Given at Rome at Saint Peter's in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord 1493.

The fourth day of the Nones of May, the first year of our Popedom. (Englished and published by R. Eden in 1577, to be found in *Hakluytus Posthumus*, printed by William Stansby for Henrie Fetherstone, London, 1625.)

4

- 1 The encyclical was published shortly after the Council of Lyons in 1245.
- 2 *Romanus Pontifex super reges et regna constitutus a Deo, in Ecclesia militanti hierarcha summus existit, et super omnes mortales obtineus principatum, sedensque in solio iudicii . . .* (Pope Boniface VIII, on the occasion of the election of Ladislas as King of Hungary.)
- 3 *Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omnem humanam creaturam declaramus, definimus, dicimus et pronunciamus, omnino esse de necessitate salutis.* (Pope Boniface VIII's Bull, *Unam Sanciam*.)
- 4 The full Latin text of the bull, *Pastor Æternus*, including the definition of Papal Infallibility, can be found in *Papalism*, pp. 719-24, by Rev. Edward Denny.
- 5 e.g. the Bavarian Government, which repeatedly urged the British Government, headed by Gladstone, to lead the diplomatic assault upon the Vatican Council.
- 6 Decree issued by the Holy Congregation of Rites. See *Papal Brief*, published by the *Osservatore Romano*, 2.4.1951. The promotion of Gabriel was due to the fact that, to quote from the official document: "Gabriel the Archangel brought the announcement of mankind's salvation when humanity was almost overcome with darkness. . . ."
- 7 Cardinal Tedeschini. Official account to pilgrims of Fatima, Portugal, 13.10.1951.
- 8 Cardinal Tedeschini, the Pope's delegate, at the Shrine of Fatima, Portugal, 13.10.1951. See world and Catholic Press, 14/15/16.10.1951. Theologians said that, while Catholic tradition was full of visions in the lives of patriarchs, apostles, and saints, there is no recorded instance in modern Church history of a Papal vision having been announced in his life-time. See *Daily Mail*, 15.10.1951.
- 9 Description by the Jesuit Father H. S. de Caires, S.J., approved and authorized by the Archbishop of Dublin, 1946. *Fatima*, Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 1950.
- 10 *idem*
- 11 Total for six years: two million. "We must bear in mind that there are other well-known shrines, which under similar conditions received no more than one-eighth of the number of those who visited Fatima," a Jesuit with an eye for competition pointed out. See *Fatima*, Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 1950.
- 12 Pope Pius XII, in a broadcast to the pilgrims of Fatima, 13.5.1946.
- 13 Father Edmund Walsh, Vice-President of Georgetown University.
- 14 Father Ray Goggin, S.J. See Philippine Press of the period. Also *Universe*, 21.4.1950.
- 15 General Grow, while American military attaché in Moscow in 1950, kept a diary in which he wrote the above-quoted words. The diary was secretly photostatted and the most revealing pages published in the *Berliner Zeitung*, 3.1.1952. The General's recall from Moscow was announced the next day. Washington admitted the accuracy of the photographs, and Congressmen asked that the General be court-martialled. For

- further details see *New York Herald Tribune*, 7.3.1952; also the book *Auf dem Kriegspfad* ("On the Road to War"), published in Germany in 1952.
- 16 Father Francis Connell, C.S.S.R., Professor of Moral Theology at the Catholic University of Washington.
 - 17 Cardinal Tedeschini, Papal delegate, Fatima, 13.10.1951. See world Press.
 - 18 *Collier's* special issue, last week of October, 1951.
 - 19 *Collier's* prediction: By 1960 Russia would be wholly transformed into a Capitalist country, under the auspices of the U.S.A.
 - 20 See the leader, *Universe*, 30.3.1951.
 - 21 See extraordinary issue of *Osservatore Romano*, 17.11.1951. Also Catholic Press—e.g. *Tablet* and others. Photographs of the miracle of the sun were reproduced also by the American Press—e.g. *Time*, 3.12.1951.
 - 22 See *New York Herald Tribune*, 7.2.1951.
 - 23 Published September, 1951. See Australian Catholic and lay Press.
 - 24 18.11.1951. See Press.
 - 25 See London *Times*, 22.10.1951.
 - 26 F. Dulles, Detroit, 27.11.1951. See American Press.
 - 27 6.12.1951. See London *Times*, 7.12.1951.
 - 28 General H. Robertson, former C-in-C., Commonwealth Forces in Japan, to a secret session of members of all parties. See statement of Mr. Menzies, Australian Prime Minister, House of Representatives, 28.11.1951, complaining about the breaking of the secret. London *Times*, 22.12.1951. Regulation shoulder flashes with the letters "U.S.S.R." were issued in 1952. The Communist paper, the *Daily Worker*, reproduced the badge on several occasions (e.g. 18.3.1952).
 - 29 Cardinal Tedeschini, 13.10.1951. Fatima, Portugal. For further details see the *Osservatore Romano*, sundry numbers second week of March, 1952. Also *Time* magazine, 17.3.1952; also *The Voice of Fatima*, March, 1952; also the obtuse Catholic weekly, *Universe*, which continued to affirm that the pictures were "authentic" in spite of the disclosures of the photos having been proved "fakes," 14.3.1952.
 - 30 Pope Pius XII, 1.11.1950, St. Peter's Rome, addressing the crowd on the dogma of the Assumption.
 - 31 Pope Leo XIII's encyclical, *Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens*.
 - 32 The original single crown was first used by Hildebrand (1073-85), who wore it as an external attribute of Papal sovereignty, with the legend *Corona regni de manu Dei*. The second was added by Boniface VIII (1294-1303), with the legend *Diadema imperii de manu Petri*. John XXII completed it with the third.
 - 33 One of the main reasons which has prevented the Vatican from accrediting a nuncio to Great Britain was the fear that the British Government, being Protestant and hence not recognizing the Pope as the supreme head of Christendom, might refuse to consider the Papal representative as the Doyen of the Diplomatic Corps at the Court of St. James. In 1938 the Vatican appointed an Apostolic Delegate, with *non-diplomatic* status.

5

- 1 *Civiltà Cattolica*, 6.10.1906.
- 2 Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930.
- 3 Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930.
- 4 Leo XIII, *Arcanum*, 1880.

- 5 Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930.
- 6 Pius XI, *Casti Connubii*, 1930.
- 7 *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November, 1950.
- 8 Washington, D.C. See *Times, Herald*, 16.3.1950.
- 9 U.S. Kinsey Report.
- 10 *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness*.
- 11 *New York Daily News*, 31.3.1951.
- 12 In September, 1951, Deputy Nelson Carneiro argued with Congress for a Bill which would permit a loophole in the Constitution under strict control: annulment for incompatibility. But even such a mild proposal was defeated by the Catholic Deputies.
- 13 *Report of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and University Studies*, February, 1952.
- 14 Leo XIII, *Sapientiae Christianae*, 1890.
- 15 Leo XIII, *Sapientiae Christianae*, 1890.
- 16 Pius XI, *Divini Illius Magistri*, 1931.
- 17 Pius XII, *Summi Pontificatus*, 20.10.1939.
- 18 Instructions of Archbishop Murray, of St. Paul, Minnesota, U.S.A., December, 1949, and other American hierarchs.
- 19 Words of the Catholic Workers' Guild of North Ayrshire to the Ayrshire Council of Education Committee, 27.1.1950.
- 20 See special article in *Collier's*, November, 1948.
- 21 Pius XI, *Divini Illius Magistri*, 1931.
- 22 Pius XI, *Divini Illius Magistri*, 1931.
- 23 See *Una Explicacion Breve y Sencilla del Catequismo Catolico*, by R. P. Angel Maria de Arcos, 14th ed., 1927, reprinted and distributed 1945-6.
- 24 Pope Pius XI, *Divini Illius Magistri*, 1931.
- 25 Catholic intransigence can be judged by the following fact: all English schools were under the obligation to start the day with an Act of Worship, and to give a minimum of two hours' religious instruction a week. The Free Churches and the Church of England agreed on a basic religious syllabus, in accordance with the 1944 Bill proposed by the State. But not the Catholic Church. Catholic children had to be taught Catholic teaching only, for one hour a day, she asserted. Even if the State should accede to this, the Catholic hierarchy said, Catholics should have the right to veto all teachers in State schools whom they did not think fit to teach—for instance, those tainted with Communism.
- 26 Warning issued by the Bishop of Salford. See *Catholic Herald*, 31.8.1951.
- 27 See *Universe*, 1.9.1947.
- 28 It was estimated in 1950 that by 1955 they would grow to 3,500,000.
- 29 Pius XII, 14.9.1951.
- 30 *New York Times*, 12.2.1951.
- 31 Guido Gonella, 1951.
- 32 Riots occurred at Neendakara, near Quilon, in November, 1951, followed by others in subsequent months. See *Universe*, 9.11.1951.
- 33 Cardinal Griffin's instruction at a Catholic school rally, 30.1.1950.
- 34 Petsche, Mayer, Bidault, Reynaud.
- 35 Pius XII, to the delegates of the Italian Catholic Social Week, held in Genoa, May, 1951.
- 36 Pius XII, 3.6.1951.
- 37 Pius XII, 14.10.1951.
- 38 For full text, see *Civiltà Cattolica*, 6.10.1906.

- 39 *Some Tribal Origins and Customs of the Balkans*, by M. E. Durham; 1928. (Allen and Unwin.)
- 40 Bishop Douglas of Motherwell. See *Universe*, 6.5.1949.
- 41 Bishop Heenan, to Leeds Catholic Parents' and Electors' Associations. See *Catholic Herald*, 28.9.1951.
- 42 See *Catholic Herald*, 12.10.1951.
- 43 Pius XII, 10.3.1948.
- 44 Decree of Excommunication issued by the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, 13.7.1949.
- 45 Monitum of the Holy Office, published in *Osservatore Romano*, 27.7.1950.
- 46 Among other Fascist groups co-ordinated by Catholic Action: Movimento Sociale Italiano. Mussolini's *Il Popolo d'Italia* reappeared at this period (December, 1951). See *London Times*, 6.12.1951.
- 47 7.7.1950.
- 48 See *Catholic Herald*, 28.7.1950.
- 49 See *Tablet*, 3.6.1950.
- 50 July, 1950.
- 51 e.g. Montreal City Council, by laws requiring all big shops, whether Catholic or not, to close on Catholic holidays, by obligation. These laws were vainly opposed by the Montreal Board of Trade (1951).
- 52 Bogota, August, 1946.
- 53 See Uruguayan Press, 1951-2.
- 54 November, 1951.
- 55 November, 1951.
- 56 October, 1951.

6

- 1 Decree of the Holy Office. Article 684, Canon Law. See *Osservatore Romano*, 12.1.1951. This came as a surprise, not only to Rotarians in general, but also to many who, like the President of the Rotary International (Mr. Lagueux of Quebec), were Catholics.
- 2 See *London Times*, 16.1.1951.
- 3 Pope Pius XII, 1.11.1950.
- 4 Pius XII, 29.2.1949, addressing the crowd in St. Peter's Square.
- 5 Pius XII's address to workers, 29.10.1949.
- 6 Rev. Dr. J. C. Heenan, of the Catholic Missionary Society.
- 7 Pius XII's speech addressed to members of the Pontifical Academy of Science, 22.11.1951. (See *London Times*.)
- 8 Pius XII's utterances reflected the influence of Jesuits—very powerful under his Pontificate—as his “ghost writers.”
- 9 See Edwin M. McNeil Poteat, 2.2.1951, President of the P.O.A.U.
- 10 Mgr. Sheen's Lenten sermon was “Psycho-analysis and Confession,” 1947.
- 11 *Time*, 14.4.1952.
- 12 Dr. E. H. Larkin. For more details of the Catholic attitude, see *The Catholic Doctor*, 5th ed., 1951.
- 13 Dec. Holy Office, 2.12.1940. *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*, Vol. 32, 1940, pp. 553-4.
- 14 *idem*. See also Pope Pius XII's address. *Catholic Herald*, 9.11.1951.
- 15 See leader, *Universe*, 13.4.1951.
- 16 See Pius XII's address to the 4th International Congress of Catholic Doctors, 29.9.1949.
- 17 January, 1950.

- 18 *Osservatore Romano*, first week of December, 1951.
- 19 For full text see *Catholic Herald*, 13.4.1951.
- 20 Archbishop of Glasgow's pastoral letter on Feast of St. Andrew, December, 1951.
- 21 Pope Pius XII's address to the delegates attending the Congress of Italian Catholic Union of Midwives and Obstetricians, Rome, 29.10.1951.
- 22 Leader in the *Birmingham Post*.
- 23 *Church of England Newspaper*, 8.11.1951.
- 24 Declarations of Father Alphonsus Bonnar, Birmingham.
- 25 See *Marriage, Morals, and Medical Ethics* (P. J. Kennedy), by two U.S. Catholic doctors, F. L. Good and the Rev. Otis F. Kelly, 1951.
- 26 Alderman Griffin, of Nottingham.

7

- 1 The Irish Medical Association, after the scheme was defeated, came out with a plan of its own, previously submitted to the scrutiny of the Irish hierarchy. Its efforts to keep medicine as a pure money-spinner were very poorly disguised under the label of "voluntary insurance." The scheme was endorsed by the Irish Catholic Societies' Vocational Organization Conference, 1952.
- 2 April, 1951. For more details, see the Irish Press—e.g. the *Irish Times* and other organs.
- 3 e.g. Captain Cowan, a Catholic.
- 4 *Universe*, 27.4.1951.
- 5 *Catholic Herald*, 4.5.1951.
- 6 The leader of *Universe*, 27.4.1951.
- 7 Pius XII, October, 1947. See also *Universe*, 7.11.1947.
- 8 Pius XII, 6.11.1949.
- 9 See *China Shakes the World*, by Jack Belden.
- 10 Pius XII spoke on the subject in three complementary addresses delivered, on 6.11.1949, to a Conference of Italian lawyers; on 13.11.1949 to members of the Tribunal of the Rota; and on 17.11.1949 to a group of U.S.A. Senators.
- 11 Protestant denominations specifically named being Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Disciples of Christ. Declaration of the Holy Office, 30.1.1950.
- 12 Mr. Justice Lynskey, Mr. Justice Wallington, and Mr. Justice Barry (1950).
- 13 Mgr. G. Rogers, Doctor of Canon Law, in an address to lawyers, Edinburgh. See *Universe*, 13.10.1950.
- 14 *The Commonweal*, 2.12.1949.
- 15 *Theses ex universa theologia quas in Collegio Lavalliens; Societatis Jesu, defendet P. Januarius Bucceroni ejusdem societatis*. Die II Juli, 1872.
- 16 *Civiltà Cattolica*, VI, I, 652-3.
- 17 *Civiltà Cattolica*, VIII, 663.
- 18 *Civiltà Cattolica*, VI, I, 652-3.
- 19 *Civiltà Cattolica*, Serie VII, Vol. VI, p. 293.
- 20 Decree of the Holy Office, 13.7.1949.
- 21 Quoted by the Rev. W. M. Arthur, *The Pope, the Kings and the People*, pp. 26-7. The Papal King of Kings, and Roman Catholic Controversial Tracts, 1851-95.
- 22 See world Press. Teheran, 12.12.1951.

8

- 1 Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*, 1885.
- 2 Leo XIII, *Diuturnum Illud*.
- 3 Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*, 1885.
- 4 Leo XIII, *Diuturnum Illud*.
- 5 Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*, 1885.
- 6 Leo XIII, *The Christian Constitution of States*, p. 123.
- 7 Leo XIII, *Human Liberty*, pp. 145-6.
- 8 George Gallup (head of Gallup Poll), in an article in the *New York Times Magazine*, second week of November, 1951. See also *Time*, 12.11.1951.
- 9 These questions were put in the spring of 1950 to 30,000 Los Angeles students by Associate Superintendent Maurice G. Blair. See *Time*, 10.12.1951.
- 10 *idem*. To students of the eighth grade.
- 11 Several chauvinistic groups formed a National Party, calling itself the Native Americans, or the Order of the Star-Spangled Banner (1852). The rest of the country, however, called it the Know-Nothing Party, because its members were sworn to answer all questions with the words, "I know nothing about it."
- 12 St. Louis Senator O'Connor, Republican Chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, revealed this after invoking the death penalty for drug peddlars, "to put the fear of God in these outlaws." (18.6.1951)
- 13 See *Christian Science Monitor*, 18.6.1949.
- 14 Statement of W. A. Murphy, F.B.I. Special Agent. For more details, see *Christian Science Monitor*, 27.9.1949. J. Edgar Hoover, director of the F.B.I., 11.4.1951, reported that in 1950 there were 1,790,030 major crimes—one every eighteen seconds. See also official statistics available in the Library of Congress.
- 15 *Ex parte Dei Omnipotentis, Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, auctoritate quoque beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum, ejus ac nostra, de communi fratrum nostrorum consilio, compositionem hujusmodi reprobamus penitus et damnamus.*
- 16 For more details of the slaves owned by the Popes, see Alberto Guglielmotti, O.P., *Storia della Marina Pontificia*, Vol. IX, 1893, pp. 95, 97-9, 103.
- 17 *Civiltà Cattolica*, Anno Vigesimottavo, Serie X, Vol. I, Quaderno 641, Firenze, 3.3.1877.
- 18 *Ecclesia*, March, 1950.
- 19 Pius XII, to members of the World Movement for World Federal Government, 6.4.1951.
- 20 Pius IX, *Syllabus of Condemned Errors*, attached to encyclical *Quanta Cura*, 1864.

9

- 1 Attributed to Louis Veuillot, died 1883.
- 2 Pius XII, 6.4.1951, to delegates for World Government.
- 3 Leo XIII, *Libertas Præst.*
- 4 Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*.
- 5 Leo XIII, *Sapientia Christianæ*

- 6 Bull, *Mirari*, by Pope Gregory XVI. See also *Civiltà Cattolica*, Serie VII, Vol. III, p. 160.
- 7 The exhibition of J. Rodriguez's paintings at the National Museum of Bogota, Colombia, was banned and closed by Bogota's Archbishop, Crisanto Luque, in October, 1951. See *Time*, 22.10.51.
- 8 *Universe*, 4.1.1952.
- 9 e.g. Deputy Laura Diaz, March, 1950.
- 10 e.g. Guido Marri, from Arezzo, gaoled for sixteen months for "publicly vilifying the Pope and the Catholic religion," April, 1950. See Italian Press.
- 11 e.g. Maria Pope, of Rome, gaoled for three months in Naples for kissing a man in the main square of Capri. 19.10.1950.
- 12 e.g. Case of Edith Toussau, publicly insulted by the Catholic Deputies in Rome because of her deep-plunging neckline worn in a Rome restaurant (July, 1950). Catholic deputies afterwards asked the Government that "immorality in public dress be banned by law."
- 13 See Catholic newspapers of Antwerp.
- 14 Catholic pressure forced the Hague Court to decide that "a dispute" existed between the Western Powers and Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria over the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and other Catholic clergy. March-April, 1950.
- 15 Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*.
- 16 Leo XIII.
- 17 Leo XIII, *Sapientiae Cristianae*.
- 18 Leo XIII.
- 19 Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*.
- 20 Leo XIII.
- 21 Thomas Sanchez, *Op. Mor. in præc. decalogi* III, VI, No. 15. This thesis was condemned by Innocent XI, but Sanchez's work is still reckoned by the Roman Curia among the classical Catholic works.
- 22 See Chapter 15.
- 23 *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, January, 1948.
- 24 *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, April, 1949.
- 25 During the great tax-evasion scandals of 1951-2 a remarkable proportion of those involved were Catholics.
- 26 Files of the *National Association of Evangelicals*, 1951-2; also *El Nacional*, of Baranquilla, Colombia, a Catholic newspaper, October/November/December, 1951.
- 27 *Essay on Sir James Macintosh*—Macaulay.
- 28 Leo XIII, *Sapientiae Cristianae*.

10

- 1 Roberto Rossellini's *The Miracle*. Cardinal Spellman called the boycott on 7.1.1951.
- 2 Dr. Downey, Archbishop of Liverpool. See *Observer*, 25.11.1951.
- 3 Lord Pakenham, First Lord of the Admiralty; Mr. R. R. Stokes, Minister of Works; Mr. John Wheatley, Lord Advocate.
- 4 Years later, President Roosevelt told a delegation of the American Youth Congress that he had been misinformed and had made a mistake in his policy towards Spain.

- 5 Mr. Francis Matthew, U.S. Secretary of the Navy, during a speech in Boston, 25.8.1950.
- 6 *New York Times*, 2.8.1950.
- 7 *Collier's* magazine, 25.3.1950.
- 8 Walter Trohan, *Chicago Tribune*, 19.2.1950.

11

- 1 Copenhagen, Denmark, 24-28.4.1950.
- 2 See *Christian Science Monitor*, 18.7.1949.
- 3 August, 1950. See French Press. Also *Catholic Herald*, 25.8.1950.
- 4 Schuman's declaration. See *Catholic Herald*, 1.9.1950.
- 5 The Earl of Perth, Secretary-General from the League's foundation in 1919 until 1933. Later Catholic British Ambassador to Fascist Italy.
- 6 Mrs. Mary Tenison-Woods, distinguished Catholic laywoman of Australia.
- 7 Declaration of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, April, 1951.
- 8 See *New York Times*, 28.1.1951.
- 9 See *New York Times*, 30.1.1951.
- 10 *New York Herald Tribune*, 2.2.1951.
- 11 Resolution moved by Vyshinsky, Russian Foreign Secretary.
- 12 These were the words of the American delegate at U.N.O., Mr. Mansfield. See *London Times*, 22.12.1951.
- 13 At the same period two parachutists were dropped in Moldavia, South-west Russia, by the American Intelligence in Germany. Vyshinsky's disclosure at U.N.O. Assembly, Paris, 21.12.1951.
- 14 See U.N.O. Resolution, 9.12.1950. Also *London Times* and *Manchester Guardian*, 9-12.12.1950.
- 15 *Civiltà Cattolica*, first week February, 1951.
- 16 P. J. S. Serrarens, Secretary-General of International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, Utrecht, Holland. See *Universe*, 17.8.1951.
- 17 *Tablet*, 28.10.1950, and other Press.
- 18 Held in Florence, June, 1950.
- 19 See pamphlet prepared by Unesco, published in Britain by the Bureau of Current Affairs, June, 1950.
- 20 Trade Unionists were executed in 1951. See appeal addressed by the President of the Socialist International to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, *London Times*, 27.11.1951.

12

- 1 *Royal Traffic with the Vatican*, published by *The Monthly Record*, the official organ of the Free Church of Scotland, May, 1951.
- 2 The Vicar-General of the Catholic Archdeacon of Westminster, Mgr. Eustace Morrogh Bernard.
- 3 *Civiltà Cattolica*, 15.7.1940.
- 4 Mgr. O'Hara. During the espionage trial which followed, eleven defendants, including four Frenchmen from the French Legation in Bucharest, charged with spying, under the direction of the French

- military attaché, received sentences ranging from twenty years' to twelve years' hard labour. Three Rumanians were sentenced to death, October, 1950.
- 5 See Kung-Pao newspaper of Tientsin, 26/27/28.2.1950. Also *New York Times*, 2.3.1950.
 - 6 As last footnote.
 - 7 Father Coughlin, in his journal *Social Justice*, May, 1940.
 - 8 Address at the Florida State Convention of the National Council of Catholic Women, 30.4.1941.
 - 9 See Mussolini's Foreign Minister Ciano's Diaries.
 - 10 See *White House Papers*, Vol 1, p. 304, Robert Sherwood.
 - 11 *Non Abbiamo bisogno . . . Die Brennender Sonje . . .*
 - 12 *New York Times*, 6.10.1940.
 - 13 *New York Times*, 7.10.1941.
 - 14 Declaration by S. A. Lozovski, 4.10.1941.
 - 15 Mgr. B. Montini, Papal Under-Secretary of State during the celebrations of the 250th Anniversary of the founding of the Pontifical Ecclesiastical Academy, the school for Vatican diplomats, May, 1951.

13

- 1 See letters of German hierarchy, 1936. Also *Catholic Times*, 27.3.1936.
- 2 See the author's *The Catholic Church Against the Twentieth Century*.

14

- 1 For more details, see the author's *The Catholic Church Against the Twentieth Century*; also *Towards the New Italy*, T. L. Gardini, Drummond, London, 1944.
- 2 Admiral Canaris's widow, after the Second World War, became a permanent guest of the grateful Franco, following Canaris's execution in 1944.
- 3 See *Chief of Intelligence*, by Ian Colvin, Gollancz, 1951.
- 4 This was confirmed in 1952, during the trial for slander of the neo-Nazi leader Otto Remer, by Fabian von Schlabrendorf, also by Dr. Bell, 9.3.1952, *London Times*. Pastor Bonhoeffer was murdered by the S.S. in April, 1945, for his share in the plot.
- 5 Evidence given 10.3.1952, at the trial at Brunswick of Otto Remer, by Dr. Karl Lukaschek, Federal Minister for Refugees, who was a member of the Kreisau resistance group.
- 6 Fabian von Schlabrendorf—see *Collier's*, 27.7.1946.
- 7 This was later confirmed by Cardinal Preysing himself, during his visit to London, 1950. See *Tablet*, 2.9.1950.
- 8 As testified by Dr. Karl Lukaschek himself at the trial of Nazi General Remer, held at Brunswick, 10.3.1952. See *London Times*, 11.3.1952.
- 9 Cardinal Faulhaber, ironically enough, was later awarded the Grand Cross of the Order of Distinguished Service, in recognition of his "fight" against the excesses of Nazism, by the President of the Federal German Republic, Catholic Prof. Heuss (January, 1952).

15

- 1 The Belgian's name, Duchesne. The German Chancellor sent a very stiff protest to the Belgian Government and the German hierarchy.
- 2 See the author's *Catholic Terror Over Europe: The Religious Massacres of Yugoslavia*. Watts.
- 3 Leo XIII's *The Christian Constitution of States*.
- 4 See *The Irish Press*, 26.5.1933.
- 5 e.g. in 1911 the U.S.A.'s investments in Mexico totalled \$1,058,000,000 while Mexican capital investments came to only \$793,000,000 (see *The Epic of Latin America*, p. 683).
- 6 See the author's *Spain and the Vatican*, Watts, London, 1946.
- 7 See George Seldes's *The Vatican*, pp. 277-8.
- 8 See *American World Almanac*.
- 9 From a speech by Goicœchea at San Sebastian, 22.11.1937 (reported in the *Manchester Guardian*, 4.12.1937).
- 10 According to a statement made by Portea Valladares, ex-Prime Minister, at a meeting of the Cortes in Valencia, 1937.
- 11 Pope Pius XI, 14.12.1936.
- 12 Pope Pius XI, 25.12.1936.
- 13 Published 7.9.1951.
- 14 17.4.1939. See also *Voice of Spain*, 22.3.1941.
- 15 Ortega y Gasset.
- 16 World Evangelical Alliance to members of the House of Commons and British Foreign Office, December, 1944.
- 17 See document of Spanish-Axis collaboration, released by the U.S. State Department, 4.3.1946.
- 18 2.9.1945.
- 19 Pius XII's broadcast on Christmas Eve, 1941.
- 20 *Bulletin International de l'Enseignement*, April, 1951.

16

- 1 See Count Sforza's *Contemporary Italy*, F. Muller, 1946.
- 2 The Vatican had known of Hitler's Russian invasion before the invasion took place. See *Chief of Intelligence*, J. Colvin, 1951.
- 3 Third week of December, 1951—the Very Reverend Archimandrite Jonah.
- 4 Cairo, 31.1.1950. Mohammed Taber al Omari Bey, the Egyptian Minister to the Vatican, confirmed this. The report was denied by the *Osservatore Romano*, which called it "fantastic" (28.4.1950).
- 5 12.1.1951. *Universe*.

17

- 1 June-July, 1929.
- 2 See *New York Times*, 6.10.1940.
- 3 *New York Herald Tribune*, 28.6.1940.
- 4 Cardinal Pizzardo, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Seminaries and Universities. Rome, September, 1950.
- 5 Report of Rev. J. MacKay, Presbyterian and President of Princeton Theological Seminary. See *Presbyterian Life* articles, 1951.

- 6 See *Ecclesia*, I.II.1950.
- 7 Rev. J. MacKay, Presbyterian and President of Princeton Theological Seminary. See *Presbyterian Life* articles, 1951.
- 8 See article by W. E. Garrison, in *Christian Century*, autumn, 1950.
- 9 Jesuit Cardinal L. Billot, in his *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*, 1921-2.
- 10 See *Prophecy*, of Los Angeles, California, September, 1947. See London *Times*, 15.3.1952; *Time* magazine, 17.3.1952.
- 11 See Associated Press, dispatch of 12.9.1950.
- 12 See *Christian Science Monitor*, 12.9.1950.
- 13 See *Christian Science Monitor*, 12.11.1950.
- 14 Declaration of Dr. Clyde Taylor, of the National Association of Evangelicals, Washington, 18.7.1951. See also American Press; also *El Nacional*, of Baranquilla, Colombia, a Catholic newspaper, and files of the National Association of Evangelicals, 1951-2.
- 15 See *America*, 8.1.1944.
- 16 See *Report, Department of Religious Affairs of Occupied Territories*, No. 1591. Dated, Tokyo, 6.4.1943.
- 17 Speech during the 430th anniversary celebrations of Luther's proclamation of his ninety-five points, November, 1947.
- 18 The burning was directed by Abbé Nourriat, of the Church of St. Benigne, Dijon.
- 19 e.g. The Left-Wing *Franc-Tireur*.
- 20 See London *Times*, 27.12.1951.
- 21 *Montreal Herald*, 30.9.1951. See also *Time*, 27.8.1951.
- 22 See *Courier de Genève*, 15.6.1923.
- 23 *New York Times*, 6.10.1940.
- 24 See *Christian Science Monitor*, 12.11.1950; London *Times*, 15.3.1952; *Universe*, 14.3.1952; and *Time*, 17.3.1952. The burning at Badajoz took place on April 6, 1952 (see London *Times*, 17.4.1952). The attempted burning of the Protestant clergyman in Seville was referred to in the House of Commons by Sir D. Savory, when he asked Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, Minister of State, about the Note which had previously been presented by the British Ambassador in Madrid requesting Franco's Government to see "that the persons responsible for the outrage should be properly punished" (see London *Times*' report of debate in the House of Commons, 1.4.1952).
- 25 Recorder J. L. Baillargeon. See *Universe*, 27.10.1950.
- 26 Miss Cecilia Farren-Mr. Robert Reilly, 2.10.1951.
- 27 The case was subsequently debated in the British House of Commons.
- 28 Statement of the bishops of the U.S.A., 1948.
- 29 *New York Globe*, 14.12.1930.
- 30 Leo XIII, *Libertas Præstantissimum*, 1888.

18

- 1 Kublai Khan, who sent a request to Rome for a hundred missionaries to teach Christianity to the Chinese.
- 2 The Pope's bull, made to Castille, touching the New World (see Chapter 3).
- 3 See *The Far East since 1500*, by Paul E. Eckel (G. G. Harrap; 1948).
- 4 It is strange that America, as late as the beginning of the second half of the last century, was tempted into behaving like the Catholic nations in

- their dealings with Japan. Suffice it to quote the *New York Weekly Tribune*, referring to Perry's mission: "In this state of things, going thus into pagan realms," said the paper, "it behoves us not to lose opportunity of labouring for the spiritual benefit of the benighted Japanese. Let not these misguided men, fighting for their own, perish without the benefit of clergy."
- 5 General MacArthur disclosed that in 1950 there were fewer than 375,000 Christians of all denominations in the nation of 82,000,000. In 1938 the total was 407,000 (*Sunday Times*, 16.4.1950).
- 6 See dispatch of R. Hughes, *Sunday Times*, 16.4.1950.

19

- 1 See Winston Churchill, *Closing the Ring*, Vol. V, History of World War II. President Roosevelt's objection was: if the Italian people wanted to get rid of their King, they should be allowed to do so. That was democracy. Churchill—or, rather, Conservative England—thought otherwise.
- 2 Pius XII's address to the Roman aristocracy, 15.1.1947.
- 3 For more details, see the author's *The Vatican in World Politics*, 1950; Horizon Press, New York.
- 4 Pius XII, 12.3.1950.
- 5 See London *Times*, 10.2.1952.
- 6 See London *Times*, 24.1.1952. In spite of the specific political activities of Catholic Action, the *Osservatore Romano* had the effrontery to declare, on that nomination, that: "Catholic Action is not a political organization nor a political party, and therefore does not interfere in politics."
- 7 10.3.1948.
- 8 The astonishing interference of the Vatican in the political life of Italy can be judged by the fact that, in 1951, Pius XII succeeded, via Catholic Premier De Gasperi, in blatantly faking the electoral machinery, with the specific object of preventing the Left parties from being elected. Hasty, illegal modifications were forced upon the electoral machinery shortly before the regional election of June. The dishonesty of such Vatican-inspired manipulation can be gauged by the fact that, although in 1951 the Communists were ousted from many official positions, they had never been so strong as in that year, having strengthened their votes from thirty-one per cent of the country's total votes in 1948 to thirty-nine per cent in 1951. The Catholics, on the other hand, in 1951 dropped to fifty-five per cent of the total votes. Yet they were the Government. To them, of course, could be added the crypto-Fascist M.S.I., which in 1951 had trebled its votes since 1948.
- The same phenomenon occurred in France, also in June, 1951, when electoral laws were hastily modified on the Italian model. The manipulation was called "the new system of affiliation of parties," the aim of affiliation being to reduce Left representation in the National Assembly. The changes were brought in under direct pressure from Washington, to the disgust of many Frenchmen, including General de Gaulle, who protested about the U.S.A. "meddling in our affairs." Later, de Gaulle went further, by saying that "France is gradually passing into America's pocket" (*Observer*, 25.11.1951). Almost all French bishops issued pastoral

- letters, calling on Frenchmen to vote, "as an inescapable duty," to keep out the Left parties (see *Catholic Press*, first and second weeks of June, 1951).
- 9 See disclosures in *Forrestal's Diaries*, 1951.
 - 10 Pius XII, 20.4.1948.
 - 11 Of the Bethesda Naval Hospital, May, 1949.
 - 12 This incident is authentic and was narrated by Marshal Pilsudski himself to Mgr. Tokarzewski, his private chaplain.
 - 13 Excerpt from a letter addressed to Mussolini by the Fascist Ambassador in Bucharest, February, 1940.
 - 14 Okulicky, at the Moscow Trial, June, 1945.
 - 15 Sentenced to six years' imprisonment, October, 1947.
 - 16 Sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, 6.8.1947.
 - 17 For further details, see reports by the *London Times*, 4/5/8.12.1947, of the trial of Wincenty Kwiecinski, head of the secret W.I.N. organization in Central Poland.
 - 18 Central and Eastern European Commission of the European Movement, London, 21-24.1.1952. Among those present: Mr. Amery, former British Cabinet Minister; Mr. Mikolajczyk, former Polish Prime Minister; Mr. Visoianu and Mr. Gafencu, former Rumanian Foreign Ministers; Mr. Dimitrov, former chairman of the Bulgarian Peasant Party; Mgr. Varga, former Hungarian Speaker; Mr. Osusky, former Czechoslovak Ambassador in Paris.
 - 19 Señor de Madariaga.
 - 20 See special reportage, article in the *Universe*, 1.2.1952.
 - 21 *London Times*, 21.1.1952.
 - 22 Chairman was a former British Minister, Mr. Amery. Others included A. Greenwood and Clement Davies (Liberal Party leader), and R. Churchill, the British Prime Minister's son. Even the sober *London Times*, commenting upon such utterances, gave a warning. "A violent liberation," it said, "is the last thing which the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, over whose territories the battles would be fought, can want." 21.1.1952.
 - 23 See *London Times*, 21.2.1952.
 - 24 The corporations built almost all the equipment for atomic energy research. Result: atomic energy became not a national possession, but the private monopoly of the giant corporations.
 - 25 See *The Facts Are*, by George Seldes.
 - 26 Among the atomic scientists working for the Atomic Energy Commission, the "saintly behaviour" of the Du Pont and other dinosaurs became "a subject of amazed debate." For further details see *Time*, 14.1.1952.
 - 27 The 65 billion to the military, out of an 85 billion budget, became one of the main electioneering points of Senator Taft, contender for the Republican Presidential candidature, 1952. See *American Press*; also *Time*, 25.2.1952. General Franco's budget at the same period allocated seventy-five per cent of the total expenditure for military purposes (see *Bulletin International de l'Enseignement*, April, 1951).
 - 28 According to calculations of Nicholas Murray Butler.
 - 29 Statistics from the *International Review of Diplomatic and Political Science*, Geneva, requested by *The Humanist*, November, 1951.
 - 30 Declaration of Senator Brian McMahon, Chairman of the Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, after pressing President Truman to go ahead with the hydrogen bomb. 1.2.1950.

20

- 1 Born 1892; changed name to Mindszenty, after village of Mindszent.
- 2 Conclusion reached by the Committee of the Monopoly Investigation conducted by Senator O'Mahoney, also by President F. D. Roosevelt, who declared that in the U.S.A. there existed "a truly amazing state of misinformation." Honest American editors were no less outspoken: "Contrary to the beliefs of most people, Americans are the most misinformed people in the world," said the editor of the *Jersey Times*, 26.2.1949. Thomas Jefferson long ago spoke like them: "The American people know more things that are not true than any other people on earth." President Truman was no less emphatic. Referring to the powers behind the Press, Truman said that what these were "actually doing was deliberately and in cold blood setting out to poison the minds of the people. . . . A leaf right out of the books of Karl Marx and Adolf Hitler." *Time*, 9.6.1952.
- 3 E.g. the *London Times*, *Manchester Guardian*, *New York Times*, although even these were often biased.
- 4 See Sforza's *Contemporary Italy*.
- 5 See Catholic and lay Press of the period; also speeches and addresses of Pius XII, 1949-50.
- 6 See Sforza's *Contemporary Italy*, p. 169.
- 7 Catholic Adenauer became Chancellor of Western Germany towards the end of 1949, after the original Mindszenty scheme had collapsed.
- 8 See verbatim report of the Mindszenty trial, published by the Hungarian State Publishing House, 1949. The author has carefully checked the Hungarian verbatim report with the special correspondents' reportage of the *London Times* and *New York Times*, and found it accurate.
- 9 Close adviser of Cardinal Mindszenty, and the last member of the Hungarian Board of Bishops to visit Rome.
- 10 Other defendants. Father Vezer, prior of a Pauline monastery, found guilty of "having organized the murder of Red Army soldiers," was sentenced to death. Sentences passed upon the others, five Catholic priests and three laymen, ranged from eight to fourteen years' imprisonment.
- 11 Reuter, 28.6.1951.
- 12 The author can vouch for the authenticity of this statement. Documents were sent to him by a member of the Rumanian hierarchy in 1950, one year before Bishop Pacha's arrest. The name of the sender, at present residing in the U.S.A., cannot be made public. The accusations against him and the other bishops were used by the Rumanian Government during the Bishop's trial.
- 13 17.9.1951. Bishop Boros and a Catholic employee of the Italian Legation were sentenced to hard labour for life.
- 14 See announcement in *Osservatore Romano*, 18.9.1951, signed by Cardinal Piazza, Secretary of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation.
- 15 Declaration by officials of his entourage to the Press, 9.5.1951. See world Press.
- 16 Pius XII's letter was publicly read to Otto, during the wedding ceremony, by Mgr. Lallier, Bishop of Nancy.
- 17 Some 924 families, most of them supporters of the Horthy Fascist regime, including former Fascist officials, policemen, and estate and factory owners, were evicted from their homes in Budapest and their flats or houses given over to workers with large families. June, 1951.

- 18 Luce's dinosaurian cultural, political, and historical ambitions are not a figment of the author's imagination. Luce boasted that he was instructing "some of the most influential people in the world: the U.S. college graduates," via one of his organs, *Time* magazine. In 1952-3 in the U.S.A. there were 4,700,000 graduates. Of these, seventy-seven per cent were subscribers to Luce's *Time*. See also *They Went to College*, a book published by Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1952.

21

- 1 Austria: Dr. Leopold Figl, Chancellor. Belgium: Gaston Eyskens, Prime Minister. France: Georges Bidault, Prime Minister; Robert Schuman, Foreign Minister. Germany: Dr. Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor. Ireland: John A. Costello, Prime Minister. Italy: Alcide de Gasperi, Prime Minister. Luxemburg: Pierre Dupong, Prime Minister. Netherlands: J. R. H. van Schaik, Vice-Premier. Portugal: Marshal Antonio Carmona, President; Dr. Antonio de Oliveira Salazar, Prime Minister. Spain: General Francisco Franco, Chief of State.
- 2 E.g. that advocated by Catholic Statesman Schuman, in his Schuman Plan.
- 3 See *The Ciano Diaries, 1946*, pp. 46, 48, 50-60.
- 4 Pavelich had lived in Italy since 1929. Immediately after the King's murder, Mussolini, to appease world opinion, arrested him, but then set him free.
- 5 E.g. Aviation Corps Officer Kren, who, on the eve of the war, flew to Germany.
- 6 See *Nedelja*, 10.8.1941.
- 7 See *Nedelja*, 27.4.1941.
- 8 Pius XII claimed to have seen Pius X during the Conclave of 1939, and that he told him that he should prepare to become the next Pope. For more details, see *The Cross*, organ of the Passionist Fathers, Dublin, March, 1948.
- 9 Words used by Pius XII, 21.12.1939, when blessing King Victor.
- 10 See Chapter 10.
- 11 *Katolički List*, 11.6.1942.
- 12 Speech by Dr. Mirko Puk, Minister of Justice and Religion. Excerpt from stenographic record of the proceedings of a regular session of the Croatian State Assembly, held in Zagreb, 25.2.1942.
- 13 *Katolički Tjednik*, No. 35, 31.8.1941.
- 14 All the crimes described in this chapter are authentic. The author has drawn them from documents supplied by sources as politically varied as they could be: official documents of the Government of Communist Yugoslavia under Tito; documents in the archives of ex-King Peter of Yugoslavia, then residing in England; documents of the Orthodox Church; papers of Dr. M. Zekulich, who was charged jointly by the Orthodox Church and by General Mihailovich in 1942 to contact the Allies, with the special mission of informing them of the Ustashi massacres. Also from information supplied by Dr. Zekulich and by General Mirkovich, the man who overthrew the Yugoslav Government when it signed a treaty with Hitler. General Mirkovich then brought Yugoslavia into the Allied camp (1941).
Not content with this, the author personally contacted numerous Orthodox Serbs who had been eye-witnesses of the Ustashi massacres, and

- even victims who had escaped. In May, 1951, the author, Dr. Zekulich, and General Mirkovich held a special meeting in London, attended by victims of the Ustashi residing in England, from whom further documentation was added, all authenticated by names, places, and dates.
- 15 For further atrocities of this kind, see the Memorandum sent to the General Assembly of U.N.O. in 1950 by A. Pribicevic, President of the Independent Democratic Party of Yugoslavia, and by Dr. V. Belajcic, former Justice of the Supreme Court of Yugoslavia.
- 16 *idem.*
- 17 This event is described in his book, *The Concentration Camp at Jasenova*, p. 282. See also "Memorandum on crimes of genocide committed against the Serbian people by the Government of the Independent State of Croatia during World War II," dated October, 1950, sent to the President of the 5th General Assembly of the United Nations by Adam Pribicevic, President of the Independent Democratic Party of Yugoslavia; Dr. Vladimir Belajcic, former Justice of the Supreme Court of Yugoslavia; and Dr. Branko Miljus, former Minister of Yugoslavia.
- 18 See the above Memorandum.
- 19 For list of names of Catholic priests who personally committed such crimes, see p. 176, *The Martyrdom of the Serbs*, prepared by the Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese for the U.S.A. and Canada, Palandech's Press, Chicago, 1943.
- 20 Filipovic was regarded as abnormal even by many of his Ustashi colleagues. All the cases just quoted are authenticated and can be found in the files of the Yugoslav State Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes.
- 21 Here is in the rest of the relevant part of the decree :
- " 3. Such missionaries shall be responsible only to the local church authorities or directly to the local Catholic priests.
- " 4. The Roman Catholic Church will recognize as binding only those conversions which have been made in accordance with these dogmatic principles.
- " 5. Secular authorities shall have no right to annul conversions made by the Church representatives.
- " 6. The Croatian Catholic Bishops constitute a directorium consisting of three persons . . . they are authorized to consult with the Minister of Religion on all questions relating to necessary and proper procedure. . . .
- " 9 Concerning the rites to be applied in the conversions, the Croatian Roman Catholic bishops will adopt in full the rule prescribed by the Holy Congregation of the Eastern Church as of July 1941, and which has been communicated to the President of the Bishops' Council. . . .
- " 10 The Committee of the Croatian Catholic Bishops for Conversions will organize courses for those priests who are to act as instruments in the conversions of the Serbian Orthodox into the Catholic Church. In these courses they will receive both theoretical and practical instructions for their work."
- 22 Dr. Ujchich, the Archbishop of Belgrade, was executed by the partisans. The authenticity of his reply was personally confirmed by Dr. Grizogono's son, Dr. N. Grizogono, a practising Catholic. For further details, see *Ally Betrayed*, by David Martin, 1946.
- 23 Lucretius 99. 55 B.C.
- 24 Ustashi Ministers left their belongings in Stepinac's care. Minister Alajbegovic, later extradited by Anglo-American authorities and condemned to

- death in Zagreb on 7.6.1947, for instance, buried the files of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the archbishop's palace, while Pavelich himself had all the phonograph records of his own speeches carefully concealed among the files of Archbishop Stepinac's Spiritual Board in Zagreb.
- 25 Stepinac's statement to a British liaison officer, eighteen months before his trial. See *New Statesman and Nation*, London.
- 26 This was later confirmed by Stepinac himself, when, during an interview with C. L. Sulzberger, of the *New York Times*, having been told that Marshal Tito was willing to set him free or to transfer him to a monastery, Stepinac replied that "whether or not I shall resume my office, whether I go to a monastery or whether I remain here [in prison] depends only upon the Holy Father. Such things do not depend upon Marshal Tito. They depend *only* upon the Holy Father, the Pope, and upon no one else." See also *Universe*, 17.11.1950.
- 27 In the words of Marshal Tito:
 "When the Pope's representative to our Government, Bishop Hurley, paid me his first visit, I raised the question of Stepinac. 'Have him transferred from Yugoslavia,' I said, 'for otherwise we shall be obliged to place him under arrest.' We waited four months without receiving any reply."
 Tito. Zagreb, 31.10.1946.
- 28 For further details see *Catholic Terror Over Europe*, by A. Manhattan.
- 29 Owing to the split of Communist Yugoslavia from Soviet Russia, Yugoslavia became partially economically dependent upon the U.S.A. American loans were asked for and granted. The Vatican, via Catholic pressure in the U.S.A., put as a condition for all-out economic aid the *unconditional* release of Archbishop Stepinac. Release was obtained in December, 1951.
- 3 Published in the Ustashi paper *Danitza*, Chicago, Ill. No. 13, IX, 1950.

22

- 1 It is significant that Norway, a totally Protestant land, found her Nazi leader, fifth-columnist, and traitor in one of the few thousand Norwegian Catholics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A NEW AMERICAN HISTORY. By W. E. Woodward. Faber, 1949.
- AUTOPSY OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE. By Gaston Nerval. Macmillan (New York), 1934.
- BUSINESS AS USUAL. By I. F. Stone. Modern Age, 1941.
- CARDINAL BELLARMINI. Bellarm. De Rom. Pontif. L.4 C5 Para. ult., cited in the Salter's Hall Lectures.
- CARDINAL BELLARMINI OPERA, Tom. I. De Romano Pontifice, A. Coloniae, 1620, cited in Stamp's edition of Elliott's DELINEATIONS OF ROMANISM.
- CATHOLIC TERROR OVER EUROPE. By Avro Manhattan. Watts.
- CHIEF OF INTELLIGENCE. By J. Colvin. Gollancz, 1950.
- CHINA SHAKES THE WORLD. By Jack Belden. Gollancz, 1950.
- CI-DEVANT. By Anatole de Monzie. 1941.
- CONTEMPORARY ITALY. By Count Sforza. F. Muller, 1946.
- CORNERSTONES OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN AMERICA. By J. L. Blau. Beacon Press, 1949.
- THE CIANO DIARIES. Heinemann, 1947.
- DOLLAR DIPLOMACY. Nearing, Scott and Freeman. Michael Joseph, 1925.
- FACTS AND FASCISM. By George Seldes. In Fact Inc. (New York), 1943.
- HISTORY DU PAPE INNOCENT III. By F. E. von Hurter-Ammann. Paris, 1838.
- INSIDE LATIN AMERICA. By J. Gunther. Hamish Hamilton, 1942.
- I PAID HITLER. By F. Thyssen. Hodder & Stoughton, 1941.
- IRON, BLOOD, AND PROFITS. By G. Seldes. Harper (U.S.A.), 1934.
- MARRIAGE, MORALS, AND MEDICAL ETHICS. By F. L. Good and the Rev. Otis F. Kelly. Kenedy (U.S.A.), 1951.
- MEMOIRS OF ERNST VON WEIZACKER. Gollancz, 1951.
- MEMOIRS OF WINSTON CHURCHILL—Vol. IV, THE HINGE OF FATE. Cassell, 1950.
- MEMOIRS OF WINSTON CHURCHILL—Vol. V, CLOSING THE RING. Cassell, 1951.
- MR. PRESIDENT: *The First Publication from the Personal Diaries, Private Letters, Papers and Revealing Interviews of Harry S. Truman.* Compiled by William Hillman. Farrar, Straus, and Young (U.S.A.), 1952.
- PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN FUNDS. By Prof. L. Overacker. Boston Univ. Press, 1946.
- NO FRIENDS OF LABOUR. By J. M. Freeman.

- OF THE POPE'S BULL MADE TO CASTILLE, TOUCHING THE NEW WORLD. Englished and published by R. Eden in 1577, to be found in HARLVYTUS POSTHUMUS, printed by William Stansby for Henrie Fetherstone, London, 1625.
- 1,000 AMERICANS. By G. Seldes. Boni-Gaer, 1947.
- OUR VANISHING CIVIL LIBERTIES. By O. J. Rogge. Horizon Press (New York), 1950.
- PAPALISM. By the Rev. Edward Denny. Rivington, London, 1912.
- PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS IN MARITAL HAPPINESS. By L. M. Terman and Others. McGraw, 1938.
- RISE AND FALL OF THE CONFEDERATE GOVERNMENT. By J. Davis. 2 vols. Garnett & Massie (Richmond, Virginia), 1938.
- ROOSEVELT AND THE RUSSIANS—THE YALTA CONFERENCE. By Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. Cape, 1950.
- THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AGAINST THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. By Avro Manhattan. Watts, 1950.
- THE CONCENTRATION CAMP AT JASENOVA. By Mikola Kikolic.
- THE EPIC OF LATIN AMERICA. By J. A. Crow. Doubleday (U.S.A.), 1946.
- THE FACTS ARE. By George Seldes. In Fact Inc. (New York), 1942.
- THE FAR EAST SINCE 1500. By Paul E. Eckel. Harrap, 1948.
- THE FORRESTAL DIARIES. Cassell, 1951.
- THE MARTYRDOM OF THE SERBS. Palandech's Press, Chicago, 1943.
- THE PATH I TROD. By T. V. Powderly. O.U.P., 1940.
- THE POPE, THE KINGS, AND THE PEOPLE. By the Rev. W. Arthur. Hodder & Stoughton, 1903.
- THE VATICAN IN WORLD POLITICS. By Avro Manhattan. Horizon Press (New York), 1950.
- THEY WENT TO COLLEGE. Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1952.
- THOMAS À BECKET—S. THOMÆ CANTUAR. Epist. 73.
- TOTAL EMPIRE. By Fr. E. A. Walsh. Bruce Pub. (U.S.A.), 1951.
- TRACTATUS DE ECCLESIA CHRISTI. By Cardinal L. Billot.
- TRUTH ON THE TRAGEDY OF FRANCE. By Elie Bois. Hodder & Stoughton, 1940.

INDEX

- ACHESON, Dean, 51, 138, 186, 379
 Adenauer, Dr. Konrad, 51, 79, 80, 183, 271-2, 367
 Africa, Catholics in, 71, 77, 79, 154, 178, 190, 215
 Alexander, King, 275, 442
 Alsace-Lorraine, 232, 238-40
 American Civil War, 146; Colonization Society, 146; Constitution, 158; American-Japanese Peace Treaty, 51, 102; War of Independence, 140; Mutual Security Act, 201
 Americas, Popes dispose of, 33-5
 Anschluss, 81
 Anti-Comintern Pact, 309
 Arab League, 314; Arabia, 314
 Argentina, 174, 324
 Asia, Catholics in, 46, 71, 79, 178, 189-90, 254-8, 300, 310-15, Chap. 18
 Australia, 82, 184, 196, 215
 Austria, 163, 177-8, 221, 233, 238, 440, 441
- BELGIUM, 64, 70, 72, 153, 178, 187, 191, 233, 275-6, 371-5
 Benedict XIV, 88
 Benedict XV, 305, 319, 404
 Benedictines, 172
 Bismarck, 275
 Blue Division, 276, 296
 Boniface VIII, 29, 129
 Brazil, 66, 81, 209, 232, 333; Popes apportion Brazil, 35
 BRITAIN, Catholics in, 64, 114; Catholic influence in elections, 71, 72, 76; birth control, 102-4; childbirth, 104-7; education, 69, 71; and Malta, 115-19; and Ireland, 278-85; and Spain, 294; and Portugal, 258; and Czechoslovakia, 309; and Greece, 312; and Palestine, 319-20; and Press, 153; and slavery, 142-3, 145-6; Catholic influence in, 179-84; and the Vatican, 212, 215-16, 238, 266; Catholic trade unionists in, 192
 Browne, Dr. Noel, 109-14
 Brüning, Dr., 251
 Bulgaria, 207
 Byzantium, 299-302
- CALLES, President, 285-8
 Canada, 67, 79, 81, 184, 215, 334-5
- Canaris, Admiral, 264
 Canon Law, 28, 70, 336
 Castlereagh, Lord, 142
 Catholic Action, 71, 79, 173-6, 205, 377, 386, 416, 419
 CATHOLIC CHURCH and mortal sin, 75, 78; bans Communists, 76, 125-6; and science, 90-7; and medicine, 90, 97-114; and evolution, 91-2; and psychology, 97-8; and euthanasia, 98-9, 191; and birth control 99-107, 130, 191, 206; and sterilization, 100; and artificial insemination, 100; and childbirth, 104-7, 110-14; and elections, 117-18, 236, 376-80; and judges, magistrates, etc., 120-5; and land reform, 121-3; and divorce, 123-4, 191; and democracy, 126-7, 146-8, 164-9, 177, 231; and Liberalism, 126, 146-8, 164-9, 176, 231; and origin of authority, 134-6; and North American independence, 140-1, 146; and South American independence, 140-1; and education, 191, 180, 243; and labour, 191-3; and Italian monarchy, 368-71; and Belgian monarchy, 371-5; and political assassinations, 274-88; and Irish independence, 278-85; and Mexican Civil War, 285-8; and Spanish Civil War, 289-97; and Russian Revolution, 303-7; and Palestine, 319-20; and Czechoslovakia, 320-2; and Asia, Chap. 18; and China, 344; and Japan, 23-40; in support of Fascism and Nazism, 78, 163-6, 222, 225-30, 233, 240-3, 245-53, 255-9, 262-72, 290-7; anti-Communist crusade of, 42-55, 125-6, 177, 224, 229-31, 247, 260-72, 276-88, Chap. 19, 300-6, 308-10
 Catholic Trade Unions, 176, 181, 192
 Catholic Women's League, 172
 Catholic Youth Loyalty Corps, 224
 Catholic Youth Organization, 292
 Chamberlain, 309
 Chapin, Selden, 418-19
 Chiang Kai Shek, 121, 137-8, 175, 198, 224, 429
 Chicherin, 306
 Chile, 324
 China, 87-9, 101, 121-2, 175, 190, 196, 198-202, 206, 224, 314, 344-65

- Christian Democratic Union Party, 268
 Christian Democrats, 149, 173; in Italy, 79-80, 152; in Poland, 386
 Christian Front, 226
 Church of England, 64, 105
 Churchill, Winston, 369
 C.I.O., 191
 Clark, General Mark, 47, 52
 Clement XI, 88
 Colombia, 81, 140, 166, 326-8
 Conference of Versailles, 238
 Consalvi, Cardinal, 142
 Consistorial Congregation, 77
 Copernicus, 93
 Coughlin, Father, 226
 Council of Europe, 193-5
 Croatia, 233, 238, 275, 443-6, 449; religious minorities in, 449; racial persecution in, 450-1; Croatian Peasant Party, 438; Nationalist-Catholic Army, 439; Croat leaders, 438-42; massacres in, Chap. 21
 Czechoslovakia, 68, 178, 233, 309
- DE GASPERI, 79, 174, 261
 Denmark, 204
 De Valera, 259, 284
Dilectissimi Nobis, 291
 DIVORCE, 41, 62-7; in Britain, 64; in U.S.A., 64; in Belgium, 64; in Sweden, 64; in Netherlands, 64; in New Zealand, 64; in Denmark, 64; in France, 64; in Switzerland, 64; in Japan, 64; in Canada, 64
 Dominicans, 345, 360
 Dublin, Archbishop of, 112-13
 Dulles, J. F., 51
 Dunn, J. C., 379
- ECUADOR, 81
 Eden, Anthony, 51
 Edward VII, King, 219
 Edwards, W. J., 180
 Egypt, 67, 77, 79, 104, 154, 178, 314
 Eire, 18, 194, 259
 Eisenhower, General, 52
 Elizabeth II, Queen, 221
 "Equivocation," 156-63, 242-3
- FALANGE, 292, 296
 Fall, Senator, 288
 Far East, Popes dispose of, 37
 Farouk, King, 314
 Father Christmas, 329-32
 Fatima, 309
 Faulhaber, Cardinal, 270, 417
 Federation of Catholic Universities, 154, 190
 Finland, 309
 Forrestal, James, 380-1, 413
- France, 178, 182, 187, 241, 294; morality in, 65; education in, 68, 72, 79; elections in, 76; science in, 96; child-birth in, 107; and Czechoslovakia, 309; and the Vatican, 218, 232-3, 238-40, 243-5, 351-3; Catholics in, 275; and Indo-China, 351-3
 Franciscans, 88, 172, 345, 360
 Franco, 178, 186, 197, 264, 292-7, 434
 Franco-Prussian War, 318
 Free Church of Scotland, 221
 Free Russia Committee, 48, 396
 Frings, Cardinal, 80
 Fromm, General, 270
 Fulton Sheen, Mgr., 98
- GALILEO, 93
 Gasparri, Cardinal, 319
 Gasquet, Cardinal, 282
 Genoa, Conference of, 306-8
 GERMANY, 51, 65, 79, 97, 160, 164, 176-8, 182-4, 221, 233, 238-43, 247-53, 262-72, 293, 318; German Condor Legion, 293
 Goebbels, 263
 Goma, Archbishop, 291-2
 GREECE, 74, 312; and the Orthodox Church, 301; Greek war, 312; Gregory VII, 30-1; Gregory XIII, 91; Gregory XVI, 384
 Griffin, Cardinal, 71, 180
 Grow, Major-General R. W., 46
 Gruenther, General A. M., 185
 Guatemala, 197
 Gury, 156
- HAPSBURG, House of, Chap. 20, 436-46
 Harriman, Averell, 229
 Herriot, Edouard, 243-5
 Hess, Rudolf, 263
 HIERARCHIES, 49-51, 170-6, 274; German, 160, 241, 270; Belgian, 372-5; American, 50, 124-5, 161-2, 168, 197, 218, 225-30, 378; Hungarian, 121-2, Chap. 20; French, 72-6, 243-5; Spanish, 75, 290, 324-6; Italian, 75-6, 78, 159, 245-7, 375-80; Czechoslovakian, 17-25, 320-2; Irish, 110-14, 279; British, 114, 179-84; Maltese, 115-19; Colombian, 81; Uruguayan, 81; Puerto Rican, 81; Mexican, 285-9; Argentine, 324; Chilean, 324; Polish, 386-7; Yugoslav, Chap. 21
 Hindenburg, von, 251
 Hinduism, 132
 HITLER, 160, 222, 227, 237, 241-3, 248-52, 262-72, 275, 293, 295, 309, 407, 443-7
 Hlond, Cardinal, 387

- Holland, 70, 79, 107, 159, 174, 178, 187, 194, 329
 Holy Inquisition, 41, 93, 140
 Holy Year, 1950, 174
 Horthy, Admiral, 409, 418, 442
Humani Generis, 91
 Hungary, 71, 121-2, 160, 178, 206-7, 233, Chap. 20, 441-2
 Hurley, Bishop J., 227
 Huss, John, 320-2
- INDIA, 104, 189, 196, 199-201, 206; and education, 71; and elections, 79; and birth control, 101
 Indo-China, 154, 351-2
 Indonesia, 178, 190, 314
 Innitzer, Cardinal, 417
 Innocent III, 29, 34-5, 140; Innocent IV, 29, 37, 345
 Institute Pro Russia, 309
 International American Catholic Congress for Social Studies, 192
 International Catholic Emigration Commission, 191
 International Catholic Office of the Cinema, 191
 International Christian Information Bureau, 192
 International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, 192
 International Congress of Catholic Artists, 190; Engineers, 190; Esperantists, 190; Nurses, 190; Missionary Union of Clergy, 190; Sacred Music, 190; Social Studies, 191
 International Court of Justice, 154
 International Federation of Catholic Transport Guilds, 191
 International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues, 190, 154
 Ireland, 109-14, 152, 233, 238, 278-85, 333; Popes dispose of, 33
 Islam, 311, 313-15
 Israel, 202-3
- ITALY, 65, 78-80, 147, 152-3, 157, 159, 163, 177-8, 209, 221, 232-3, 245-7, 256, 260-2, 276, 292-3, 309, 319-20; Communist Party in, 376
- JAPAN, 51, 64, 87, 101-2, 104-5, 107, 154, 160, 189, 230, 232-3, 254-8, 309, 328-9, 353-64; "Exclusion Edict," 361-2
 Jesuits, 87-8, 95, 159, 162, 172, 239
- KAAS, Mgr., 177, 251-2
 Kemal Ataturk, 301-2
 Kennan, George, 47-8, 51, 390
 Kirkpatrick, Sir Ivone, 183
 Knights of Columbus, 173, 287
- "Know Nothings," Party of, 141
 Korea, 89, 189, 196, 198
 Krupp, Alfred, 194
 Kublai Khan, 346-7
- LATERAN TREATY, 80, 174
 Latin America, 178, 189, 196-7, 199-201, 285-9
 League of Catholic Youth, 286
 League of Nations, 195, 294, 309
 Legion of Decency, 153, 174
 Leo III, 37; Leo XIII, 147, 176, 238; on Popes, 55, 151; on education, 69; on toleration, 337
 Leopold, ex-King, 194, 233, 275, 371-5
 Liberalism a mortal sin, 78
 Liberia, 146
 Liguori, St. Alphonsus, 156
 Lincoln, 146, 274
 Lloyd George, 281-2, 301, 406
 Louis IX, 346
 Lourdes, 44, 410
 Luxemburg, 178
- MACARTHUR, General, 102, 364, 429
 MacBride, 113
 MacCarthy, Senator, 175
 McGrath, Howard, 185
 McMahon, Senator Brian, 393
 Maglione, Cardinal, 265
 Magna Carta, 139-40
 Malta, 79, 115-19, 275
 Mao Tse Tung, 121
 Marriage, 62-7
 Maryland Colonization Society, 146
 Marx, Dr., 250
 Mather, Cotton, 145
 Matthews, Francis, 185
 Maximilian, Emperor, 232, 400-1
 "Mental reservation," 156-63, 242
 Mexico, 81, 182, 197, 232-3, 276, 285-9, 328
 Mindszenty, Cardinal Joseph, 70, 206, 233, Chap. 20
Modus Vivendi, 211-12, 273
 Monroe, President, 146
 Moors, 37
 Morocco, 314
 Moslems, 132-3, Chap. 18, 314
 M.R.P., 177
 Mussolini, 43, 80, 159, 174, 222, 246, 256, 261, 264, 267, 293, 295, 320, 407, 443, 447
- NATIONAL CATHOLIC YOUTH COUNCIL, 172
 National Federation of Catholic College Students, 154
 National Front (Italy), 79
 N.C.W.C., 205, 218
 Nehru, 201

- New Zealand, 184
 Nicholas III, 347
Non Expedit, 147
 Norway, 204
 Nuncios, 56-7
- OREGON, General, 288
 O'Connell, Cardinal, 225
 Oertzen, Major Ulrich von, 267
 Okulicky, General, 386
 Olbritch, General F., 267, 270
- ORTHODOX CHURCH, 15-17, 384; in politics, 75, 273; history of, 299-303; in U.S.A., 313; and Vatican, 231-2; Orthodox, 93, 312-13; Orthodox clergy massacred, 446-56
- PAKISTAN, 101, 196, 206
 Pan-Orthodox Synod, 312
 Papan, von, 251
 Pappalardo, Mgr., 261
 Paul III, 144; Paul IV, 31
 Pavelic, Ante, Chap. 21
 Pax Romana, 190
 Pearl Harbour, 230, 265, 328, 429
 Penn, William, 145
 Peron, 174
 Perry, Commodore, 363
 Persia, 132-3, 314
 Peru, 152, 328
 Philippines, 77, 79, 216, 232, 328
 Pilsudski, Joseph, Chap. 19
 Pius V, 31; Pius IX, 147, 162; Pius X, 62, 74, 402, 437
 Pius XI, 147, 159, 173, 209, 245, 247, 249, 293, 319, 407
 PIUS XII, 175, 220, 227-9, 259, 261, 265, 410, 422, 428, 446-7, 463-4; and Germany, 249-53; on the Popes, 28, 55; on Virgin Mary's ascension, 39; on Archangel Gabriel, 40; and miracle of the sun, 41, 49, 50; on Fatima, 45; on Communism, 50-1; excommunicates Communist sympathizers, 45, 77; and education, 70; on private property, 73; on Trade Unions, 73; on politics, 74; and elections, 77, 148; on science, 91-2, 95; on evolution, 92, 94; on childbirth, 104-7; on judges, 120-1; "the best anti-democrat," 149; on democracy, 149; on Spain, 296; on rebellion, 375
 Plunkett, Count, 284
 Poland, 170, 178, 209, 238, Chap. 19, 423
 Polo, Marco, 346
 POPES, history of, 20-4; spiritual and political power of, 24-36, 56-8, 131-3; coronation of, 56; and education, 67-72; alter the calendar, 91; claim supremacy over England, 33; over Kings, 31-5, 129; over Protestants, 31; 38, 124; over Orthodox, 38; over whole world, 29, 37, 38; over after-life, 40; over State, 118-19; claim to judge science, 92; Infallibility of, 38-40, 56-8, 94-5, 127-8; condemn Magna Carta, 140; condemn French Revolution, 140; condemn Liberalism and Democracy, 148
 Portugal, 96, 141, 163, 178, 232, 258-9
 Protestants, 62, 64-6, 83, 90, 93, 102-7, 119, 123-4, 146, 152-3, 158, 163, 183, 207, 212, 216, 219, 231-2, 275, 277-9, 295-7, 307, Chap. 17; in Asia, 343, 361
 Psychology, 98
 Puerto Rico, 81
- Quadragesimo Anno*, 163
 Quakers, 146
- REARMAMENT, 48, 51, 194, 225
 Religious Orders, 172
 Remer, General Otto, 184, 272
Rerum Novarum, 163
 Revelation, 93, 95
 Rhineland, 232, 241-3
 Rivera, Primo de, 290, 292
 Robles, Gil, 291-2
 Rocy, Cardinal Van, 372, 412
 Rommel, Marshal, 270
 Roosevelt, F. D., 217, 228, 265, 314, 369, 408
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 216
 Rotary Clubs, 90, 337
 Royall, Kenneth C., 416
 Rumania, 160, 207, 223, 304
 Russia, 182-3, 195-6, 201, 225, 227, 260, 262, 264, 271, 273, 276, 300-6
- SAAR, 232, 236-7
 St. Augustine, 50
 St. Joan's International Social and Political Alliance, 154, 191
 St. Laurent, Louis, 81, 334
 Salazar, 178, 258
 Salesians, 172
 Sanfedisti, the, 147
 Schuman, 51, 194
 Schuster, Cardinal, 75
 Segura, Cardinal, 290
 Seipel, Mgr., 177, 405
 Serbia, 275, 437
 Sforza, Count, 305
 Sheen, Mgr. Fulton, 98, 225
 Slovakia, 177, 276
 Spaak, 194, 374
 Spain, 178, 186, 197-8, 206, 229, 232-3, 264, 289-97, 325-6

- Spanish Civil War, 182
 Spellman, Cardinal, 99, 102, 174, 202, 398, 408, 412, 417, 422
 Stalin, 76
 Stauffenberg, Count von, 267, 270, 275
 Stepinac, A., 206, Chap. 21
 Stieff, General H., 268
 Strickland, Lord, 115-19, 275
 Sweden, 204
 Switzerland, 178, 187
Syllabus, 147
- TAFT, William Howard, 216
 Taylor, Myron, 209, 217, 265-7, 311-12
 Tedeschini, Cardinal, 41, 49
 Tiso, Mgr., 177
 Tito, Marshal, 137
 Tobin, Maurice, 185
 Togliatti, 275, 377
 Treaty of Tordesillas, 34
 Truman, President H., 186, 217, 421
 Truman-Acheson "containment policy," 48
 Turner, Ralph E., 204
- Ubi Arcano*, 173
 Umberto, 233, 368-71
 Unesco, 203-5
 Union of Catholic Mothers, 191
 U.N.O., 101; Catholic influence in, 154, 195-205; the Vatican and the case of Spain, 197-8; of China, 198-201; of India, 199-201; of the American Mutual Security Act, 201; of the Holy Land, 30-1, 320; of Cardinal Mindszenty, 206-7
 U.N. Status of Women Commission, 196
 Uruguay, 81, 197, 206
- U.S.A., 196-203, 216-19, 225-30, 265-7, 271-2, 388-96, 398-9, 478, 480-1; and divorce, 64, 124; morality in, 65, 69, 138; and education, 68-71, 137-8; Catholics in, 79, 83, 96, 98-9, 102, 158, 161-2; Catholic vote in, 82; child-birth in, 107; Catholic censorship in, 153; political Catholicism in, 183-7, 195, 336; Catholic influence in, 191-2, 204-6, 278; and Mexico, 286-9; and Spain, 294-7, 310-15; and Asia, 363-5; and the Vatican, Chap. 19; economic aid to Franco, 198, 297; representation at Vatican, 216-18
 Ustashi, 276, Chap. 21
- VATICAN COUNCIL (1870), 128
 Venezelos, 301
 Victor Emmanuel, King, 233, 246, 261, 368-9
 Virgin Mary, 295; ascension of, 39; message at Fatma, 41-55
- WALLOONS, 373
 War, cost of, 394-5
 Weimar Coalition, 250
 Weygand, 383
 Women's International Democratic Federation, 191
 World Congress of the Apostolate of the Laity, 191
 World Council of Churches, 338
 World Federation of Catholic Trade Unions, 192
 World Medical Association, 99
- YOUNG CHRISTIAN WORKERS, 191
 Yugoslavia, 206, 275-6, Chap. 21
 Yu Pin, Archbishop, 175
- ZAHAROFF, 301

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



130 828

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY