

Overlapping Jurisdictions: The Test Case of Papal Foreign Policy (1870-1922)

Epigraphs

In Cardinal Henry Edward Manning's 1877 book published in London—entitled *The True Story of the Council [of 1870]*—he said: “The special character of our age is the tendency for a party of educated men **to overturn the ancient Christian institutions which are based on the supernatural**—by which man is elevated to a higher knowledge and destiny—and to erect upon these ruins a new order founded upon natural reason alone.” (See Anthony Rhodes, *The Power of Rome in the Twentieth Century: The Vatican in the Age of Liberal Democracies, 1870-1922* (1983), pages 12-13—my emphasis added.)

“There is far greater **recuperative power** today [in 1983] than there was in the effete [393-423] Empire of Honorius. To quote Cardinal Manning again [in and as of 1877]: 'In the course of history, some forty Popes have at one time or another been expelled from Rome—nine times by Roman factions, seven times from foreign invaders. Six times the city of Rome has been held to ransom by usurpers. Twice it has been nearly destroyed. Once, it was so utterly desolate that for fifty days nothing human breathed in it, and no cry was heard but that of the foxes on the Aventine [one of the seven hills of Rome]. **Warfare, suffering, exile**—that has been the lot of many Popes. Yet with **imperishable vitality** and invincible power they persist, they remain...’” (Anthony Rhodes, *The Power of Rome in the Twentieth Century*, p.14—my emphasis added)

“In the pages of this book, an attempt will be made to describe the vicissitudes through which the Papacy passed under the four Popes of the 'Liberal' era, from 1870-1922: Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius X, and Benedict XV.” (Anthony Rhodes, *The Power of Rome in the Twentieth Century: The Vatican in the Age of Liberal Democracies* (1983), p. 14)

“The role played by [the English Cardinal] Manning during the Vatican Council of 1870, which **prescribed** the declaration of Infallibility, cannot be overestimated. During it, he became Pius IX's closest adviser and confidant....It was this very **articulacy** [of Manning] which enabled him to state clearly **the disasters** that would befall the Catholic Church **if the Dogma was not accepted**. Although he was a deeply religious man, his [soundly prudential] reasoning was notably pragmatic.”

(Anthony Rhodes, *The Power of Rome in the Twentieth Century: The Vatican in the Age of Liberal Democracies, 1870-1922*, p.17—my emphasis added.)

There is to be found a medieval legal insight, called “the *Mixta*,” that will help us, I believe, to understand more fully why and how the Church must always face up alertly and virtuously to the morally contentious—and often protractedly litigious—realms of “overlapping jurisdictions,” lest there be unjust usurpations and inordinate encroachments upon the freedom of the Church (“*Libertas Ecclesiae*”) and of the Faith. That is to say, there will always obtrusively exist those endangered realms of life that are to be found in the so-called “threshold areas” or in the ambiguous areas of the “in between”: between the pure realm of “the *Spiritualia*” and the comparably unambiguous realm of “the *Temporalia*.” For example, we distinguish respectively the sacred offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass, from the financed building of public roads and drainage. A religious procession on those secular roads, if permitted, would present an example of “the *Mixta*.” Papal Concordats have been one way down the years of establishing co-operation and the specific limits and permissions for the Church.

This mediating moral and legal reality and derivative concept were thus helpfully, yet quite compactly, expressed by one simple Latin word of “the *Mixta*.” It has constituted a convenient “kind of shorthand,” as it were. Moreover, the abiding cautionary advice “**to beware of 'the *Mixta*'**” remains a permanent challenge to the Catholic Church and to the integrity and trustworthiness of the Catholic Faith.

Once again, this threshold category of the “*Mixta*—“on the margins”—pertains to the often uncertain frontiers of a jurisdiction; in other words to those equivocally **overlapping** realms of the “*Spiritualia*” and the “*Temporalia*.” Therein lies the abiding challenge: to discern and to preserve the boundaries, the limits of concession and surrender, and of unworthy compromise, and to perform the mission (or the evangelization) with trustworthy discipline and with an application of the true and first cardinal **virtue**: *prudentia*, which is that farsighted “*recta ratio agibilium*” that also preserves a memory faithful to the truth of the past (a *memoria fidelis*). But, for sure, some such putatively practical forms of cautious wisdom are **not** at all what Pope Gregory the Great himself meant, in his *Moralia*, when he so firmly criticized “**carnal prudence**”—“*prudentia carnalis, prudentia carnis*”: an inordinately fearful combination of cowardice and the evasion of accountability and responsibility.

Therefore, by our briefly considering this concept (and the challenging reality) of those “threshold areas” and “border areas” of “the *Mixta*,” we shall be helped, even now, to appreciate more fully the current inherent difficulties in Church-State relations—for example as in the current diplomatic cases of Communist Vietnam and Communist China—which display the grave limits of the arguably still allowed **“temporal sovereignty, claims, and power of the Pope.”**

Moreover, it would help us to consider that the late nineteenth century itself especially provided a good test case for Pope Pius IX himself after his having had to face the insulting results of the dispossession and spoliation of the Papal States in 1870; and thus the subsequent usurpations of the papal temporal power itself after the Italian conquest of Rome on 20 September 1870—during the time of the First Vatican Council. Yet, somehow the besieged temporal power of the Pope abided.

In any event, Medieval Christendom has presented us with three helpful categories to aid us—and the Church—in setting limits or establishing the boundaries of an accepted (or only tolerated) jurisdiction. Those three realms, once again, were called: “the *Spiritualia*” and “the *Temporalia*” and “the *Mixta*”—the spiritual, the temporal, and the mixed. For, not only did the medieval *Sacerdotium* (Holy Church as a Sacred Institution) have just and recurrent, inherent struggles with an encroaching *Imperium* (the Empire) in setting jurisdictional limits and “ownership.” The *Imperium* was to be further aided in its expanse of power by the newly discovered legal instruments of encroachment (and even coercion) from the ancient Corpus of the Code of Roman Law, as distinct from the Christian customs traditions and long-standing manner of gradually and organically fostering the Common Law, as in England.

Still today there is a remaining conflict and the hotly contested field of **“overlapping jurisdictions,”** which are often ambiguous and sometimes also intentionally equivocal, and therefore always in need of special protections and defenses—and not only with the help of various and disciplined Papal Concordats (as with Italy or Portugal or Croatia.) We may now also think of these overlapping jurisdictions in the current and contentious matter of “networked clerical sexual abuses and their own self-protective cover-ups,” and thus we may have to consider allowing—while also prudently differentiating and soberly resisting--the broader Secular State's applications of the **criminal, as well as civil** law, especially the “R.I.C.O. Laws—those laws derived from the “Racketeer Influenced and Criminal Organizations” Act of 1970, still a standing Federal Law.)

An unexpected analogy from the gracious anthropologist, Mary Douglas' 1966 book, *Purity and Danger*, might help us here further at the outset and in this context. (A Note: In the 1970s, I once memorably talked with Dr. Douglas in person and at some length. It was after her public lecture in Graduate School, at the University of North Carolina—at Chapel Hill; where the two of us alone also then vividly considered her own profound book, especially in light of the growing reality of irregular warfare: or strategic and subtly subversive revolutionary warfare, as is the case with guerrilla warfare and in some subtler forms of cultural warfare, wherein many ambiguous borders and limits—and established legal jurisdictions—are destructively manipulated and intentionally sabotaged and exploited.)

With much cumulative evidence, Professor Douglas' book has convincingly shown to us the special vulnerabilities of every culture “in the overlap areas,” especially when there is an unprotected ambiguous overlap of a **clear** realm of a carefully protected and well-defended “purity,” with the contrasting, but comparably **clear**, cultural realm of grave risk and of sliding “danger.” The “slippery slope” of the cultural permeation may be at once detected and more and more clearly seen to be emerging and spreading. Culture as such is always “**a vital medium**,” also in the spread of microbes.

One may better imagine some of the further implications of this “overlap” when we consider a visible diagram, namely a Venn Diagram, where one may visualize **two** overlapping zones: purity and danger. In that ambiguous realm of overlap, as Mary Douglas said, every wise and abidingly intact culture carefully protects that ambiguous and equivocally slippery realm with its own protective “taboos” and other “limits” and prohibitions and precautions against various forms of especially dangerous “pollution.” It is so also in the moral and legal realms of any civilization, at least implicitly. Indeed, the Catholic Church, when it has been vigilant before the World and courageously firm, has also understood this matter and has specially protected the faithful against these dangerous (but alluring) realms of overlap. For, the inordinate absorption with “the *Mixta*” all too easily taints and stains “the *Spiritualia*.” (Evelyn Waugh also once spoke of “power without grace” as a self-sabotaging “**fetid termitary of power**”—written in his 1950 historical novel, *Helena*.)

Sometimes, as personal wisdom has articulated it, “abstinence is better than temperance.” For, “a temptation wouldn't be a temptation if it weren't attractive.” Moreover, “there are no technical solutions to moral problems.”

Therefore, by virtue of the very existence of the “*Mixta*,” there will always be struggles—even perpetual warfare—about limits, and some of them are for sure of great moment to man. (In any event, “*Militia est vita hominis super terram*”—says the trenchantly candid Book of Job (7:1) so admired by Medieval Christian **Chivalry**.) Moreover, there are many lures and incentives to exploit these equivocal and lubricious “areas of ‘the *Mixta*.’” To include also the abiding temptation of “Gnosis” and the “allure of Hermeticism.” That dialectic temptation of Gnostic Hermeticism is usually to be understood as a **double** combination of **the thirst for secret knowledge and for its secret power**. Homer's Odysseus discovered this double aspiration and trial in his encounter, bound to the mast, with the alluring Sirens (*Seirēnes*)—as the Greek Church Fathers also understood it.

In light of these considerations, how might we look at the abiding challenge of papal foreign policy—as in the earlier “*Ostpolitik*” and its newer and current manifestations? How should we faithfully look at this inescapable and indispensable matter of papal foreign policy?

For that policy must always mingle with the world. And, if properly conducted, it must mingle with it with prudent responsibility, and yet with a deep and abiding loyal love for Christ and His beloved Mother. The Church must also recurrently encounter enemies from within—even strategically networking and gnawing enemies from within—who, all-too-often, are found to manifest inordinate power—and especially when it is actually “Power without Grace.” (This fertile phrase comes from Empress Helena's own gradually fruitful words of insight, words spoken more than once to her belabored and still-pagan son, Emperor Constantine. Her trenchant words are to be found in Evelyn Waugh's memorable 1950 novel, *Helena*.)

Although we may not now in this essay present much, let alone all, of his lucid scholarship here, a close reading of Anthony Rhodes' 1983 book on *The Power of Rome in the Twentieth Century* will aid us greatly in our candid understanding of some important portions of Papal Diplomatic History down the years—especially after Pope Leo XIII in 1880, only two years after his election to the Papacy and just ten years after the Italian Conquest of Rome, first opened up the Secret Papal Archives even to laymen, especially to the scholars.

Rhodes' 1983 book is actually only Volume I of his Trilogy on the remaining and still continuing “power of Rome.” For, he subtly saw the twentieth century to have **begun** in the revolutionary year of 1870. The full title of his Volume I is: *The Power of Rome in the Twentieth*

Century: The Vatican in the Age of Liberal Democracies, 1870-1922.¹ (Throughout his books, Rhodes usually employs the phrase “the Vatican,” instead of writing “the Apostolic See” or “the Holy See.”) Rhodes' Volume II is entitled *The Vatican in the Age of the Dictators (1922-1945)* (1973); and Volume III—by far the weakest and most incomplete book of the Trilogy—is entitled *The Vatican in the Age of the Cold War (1945-1980)* (1992). But they should all be carefully and closely read and savored.

In his Volume I, of the four popes he closely examines—especially their various papal policies and diplomatic methods—Anthony Rhodes most esteems the more “conciliar approach” (219) of Pope Leo XIII. He thinks that Pius IX was too intransigent and too often even “fulminating.” He admires Pius X and even considers him, at times, to be surprisingly conciliatory as well as truly simple and holy, but Rhodes often displays tones of unworthy condescension. Rhodes sees Pope Benedict XV to be in the conciliatory tradition of Leo XIII, and to have been always seeking the spread of true peace—not an embittered truce or vengeful armistice—even during the difficult times of World War I with its bitterness and desire for revenge, as with France's Georges Clemenceau.

While keeping these biases and prejudices before us, it is fitting that we show some representative passages from Rhodes' Volume I: first his depiction of the humiliating situation faced by Pope Pius IX in 1870; then the policy of Leo XIII with the “*Kulturkampf*” of Bismarck and with the pope's call (with the warm support of Cardinal Rampolla) for a Catholic “Ralliement” to the French Republic, that is, to the Revolutionary French Republic and “Democracy”; Leo XIII's treatment of the “Americanist” claims in his January 1899 Letter, *Testem Benevolentiae*, which was written and modified by the pope, along with the progressive help of Cardinal Rampolla, once again. We then propose to conclude first with Rhodes' further words about Cardinal Manning and Manning's preference for an English “Democracy” in opposition to the Protestantized, Anti-Catholic English “Oligarchy”; and finally, with Rhodes' return to his seemingly enlightened view of Pope Leo XIII and his conciliatory diplomacy. Rhodes, by way of conclusion, then adds some words about the sustained—and sustaining—power of the Vatican and the surprisingly recuperative powers of the Papacy.

During and after the Italian conquest of Rome on 20 September 1870, there were additional humiliations, as Rhodes reports them:

¹ All further references to Anthony Rhodes's volume—*The Vatican in the Age of Liberal Democracies, 1870-1922* (New York: Franklin Watts, 1983)—will be placed in parentheses above in the main body of the essay—and sometimes with my emphasis added.

Nor was the humiliation confined to Italy. In the two preceding decades, liberal and anti-clerical governments had come to power all over Europe, and they turned vengefully on a Church which had, in their opinion, exercised power in their lands for too long. France became a Republic in 1870, and revived anti-clericalism of the French Revolution. In Germany in 1870 Bismarck, fresh from his his triumphs of Sadowa and Sedan [first in Habsburg Austria in 1866 and then later in France], began his *Kulturkampf* (“Battle of Culture”) to eliminate entirely Papal influence in the much enlarged Catholic territories which Prussia now ruled over. In Spain, in 1868, Queen Isabella was expelled and Sorzano's liberal government began suppressing the convents and monasteries. In Mexico, Napoleon's Catholic and Latin bulwark against the Anglo-Saxon Protestants had been overthrown by Juarez and the firing squad of Queretaro. Even His Apostolic Majesty in Vienna, the Emperor Franz Josef, was obliged to sign anti-clerical decrees legalizing civil marriage and lay education. While in Geneva, a Congress of Anarchist Revolutionaries was acclaiming Bakunin [the Russian Anarchist Aristocrat], who had just announced the end of Christianity. In Dante's imagery, the barque of St. Peter was indeed in “dire tempest.”

It was a tempest that the Church had not known since the French Revolution or the sack of Rome in 1527, when the Constable of Bourbon's *Landsknechte* (mercenaries) danced with prostitutes on the high altar of St. Peter's, and then paraded a donkey caparisoned with Pontifical vestments through the streets. (10—my emphasis added)

Let us now treat two important aspects of Pope Leo XIII's lengthy pontificate (1878-1903): his pastoral policy (begun more or less in 1891) of a Catholic “*Ralliement*” to France's Revolutionary Third Republic; and his treatment of the disorder of “Americanism” in his personal 22 January 1899 Letter, entitled *Testem Benevolentiae* (“A Witness to the Benevolence....”).

Now to consider the French Republic and their revolutionary “Education Laws” (115):

The Catechism was replaced in the schools by the French State Instructional Manuel....The Socialists discovered, however, that **the Church in France was...extremely resilient. The priests well able to give as good as they got....**On this subject, **a Jesuit priest in Lourdes expressed himself eloquently.** “**Take the sword!**” he cried to his congregation, “**the electoral sword which cleaves the good from the bad!** In the next election, **there will be only two candidates—Jesus Christ and Barabbas. Do you intend your vote for Barabbas?**” A number of French bishops directed that the sacraments were to be withheld from all teachers, parents and pupils who used the French State Instructional Manual. In some places the *curés* made a public bonfire of these manuals.

Had the Education Laws been imposed during the reign of Pius IX [1846-1878], his fulminations would have descended in all their fury on the French Government; and **the French bishops now awaited such a condemnation** from Leo XIII. **It did not come....**Leo XIII had come to the conclusion that **open** opposition to the French Republic would **only** worsen the situation for the Church. **He therefore did not**

oppose the suppression of the Jesuit schools....It was the beginning of his policy, later to be known as *le Ralliement* [1891], in which he instructed French Catholics to “rally” to the support of the French Republic [*i.e.*, a Rally to the Revolution, to the ongoing Jacobin Revolution, indeed]. (115—my emphasis added)

However, this Papal policy of pastoral compromise—warmly and wholeheartedly supported by Leo XIII's own Sicilian Secretary of State Mariano Rampolla—turned out to be a grave failure, later to be somewhat, but not fully, repaired by the opposite policy of Pope Pius X. For Pope Pius himself then had to face the content and consequences of the 9 December 1905 “Combes Law” on the sternly unjust and protractedly deceitful Separation of Church and State, which, in reality, meant not the separation, but the **subordination** of the Church to the State. (The 1905 French Law—often commonly known as “**the Combes Law**”—was officially called the *Loi concernant la Séparation des Églises et de l'État*.)

Let us now consider Leo XIII's understanding of America in the late nineteenth century, and his developed policy towards the United States:

At this time France and the United States, both proud of their new form of republican government, were much closer than they are today [in 1983]; and the Vatican feared that France could easily come under the latter's baneful influence. The French Ambassador in Washington, M. Jules Cambon, pointed this out: “It is probable that the Holy See has kept silent until now, as long as only Americans are involved; for in America, whatever may be the effect on Catholic discipline, their Faith remains as solid as a rock [sic]. But I am now beginning to suspect that what Rome fears above all is the contagion of these American ideas in other countries [and even the later 1962-1965 Vatican Council II?]*—*particularly in France [in 1898], where they could have consequences very different from those in the United States.”

At all events, Leo XIII now decided to speak up, and warn the Catholic world of the dangers of “Americanism.” He could do this because he was personally very popular in the United States. Thanks to his great social Encyclicals such as *Rerum Novarum* [in 1891], he enjoyed an acclaim there unrivaled by that of any of his predecessors. Liberal Catholics...[like the “Americanist” Archbishop of St. Paul, Minnesota] Msg. John Ireland described him as “**the greatest Pope since Ganganelli**” (significant because Ganganelli was Clement XIV, **whose principal achievement was to dissolve the society of Jesus in 1773**). (136-137—my emphasis added)

In order to continue his conciliatory approach, Leo XIII decided to be less formal with the American Catholic Hierarchy:

In order not to offend American susceptibilities...Leo XIII did not express himself in the time-honored form of an Encyclical, but in a personal letter to Cardinal Gibbons: *Testem Benevolentiae* (“A Witness to the Benevolence....”), on 22 January

1899. Its principal **recommendations** were again summed up by the French Ambassador [Jules Cambon]:

“His Holiness states in this letter that **over matters of dogma there can be no question, even in the name of science and progress, of attenuating, or modifying, to the slightest degree the principles of Catholic belief.** Against this, His Holiness says that in matters of *discipline* [and thus in “the *Mixta*”?], **the Church is the first to adapt its laws** to the conditions of time and place, to the customs and habits of different peoples and countries [as in the earlier “*le Ralliement*” to the Third Republic in France?]**—provided that** these adaptations are **not** the work of isolated individuals acting of their own, **but** are drawn up by the responsible [ecclesiastical] hierarchy. **The Church, His Holiness insists, is far from repudiating the conquests of progress and science; on the contrary, the Church is only too willing to use them for increasing the patrimony of the human spirit,** and promoting the public good....But His Holiness emphasizes that **the Church will not tolerate,** in America or elsewhere, any Catholic organization which does not partake of **the Church's universal character,** nor recognize **the absolute authority of the Roman Pontificate.**”

Politely but firmly, the Pope censured **certain** aspects of “Americanism”: first [of all], “the desire for the Catholic Church in America different from that in the rest of the Catholic world”; second, the notion that the Church “should adapt itself to civilization” and show more indulgence to modern theories and methods....**However, he [Leo XIII] softened his censure** by adding a tribute to American Catholicism in general....The [French] Ambassador went on to say that **the Pope's letter was originally much more vehement, but that it had been considerably toned down:**

“It [*Testem Benevolentiae*] was originally prepared at the Vatican by Cardinals Satolli and Mazzella, both of whom were uncompromising enemies of Archbishop Ireland [himself the volubly intransigent leader of the “Americanists”]. As such, it was an absolute condemnation of “Americanism.” **But the Pope and his Secretary of State, Cardinal Rampolla, cut and expurgated it to such an extent that it was almost unrecognizable to its authors [Satolli and Mazzella].**” (137-138—my emphasis added)

We may now selectively consider some of England's biased and dubious associations with the Vatican:

On the death of Pius IX and the accession of Leo XIII in 1878, [Cardinal Henry Edward] Manning's **influence** waned. It seems that Leo XIII was by no means as enthusiastic [sic] about him as his predecessor had been [Leo XIII preferred Cardinal Mariano Rampolla,² the Sicilian Cardinal]....But this remarkable English convert

2 “During his long period as Leo XIII's Secretary, Cardinal Rampolla had been consistently hostile to Austria and the Triple Alliance, and friendly to its enemy, France.” (181) That is, to the France of the revolutionary, anti-clerical Third Republic. See also pages 247-248, which we shall later quote in a latter portion of the this essay, just before the **CODA**. Furthermore, and by way of contrast with Rampolla, when Manning had been asked “**why the Holy Father should touch on politics at all**” (180), Cardinal Manning incisively said: “**...because politics are a part of morals. What the**

[Manning] never again enjoyed the great power [sic] he had wielded under Pius IX, ... [at] the time of the First Vatican Council [1870] and the Proclamation of Infallibility.

Relations between the British Government and the Vatican continued to improve [during Leo XIII's reign] **in spite of setbacks** from time to time **due to the “Irish Question.”** In the Vatican Archives for 1883 is this comment on the “English Anomaly”:

“It seems **anomalous** that **the most determined enemies** of an official English representation at the Vatican—and a Papal representative in England—are **the [Catholic] Irish Bishops.**”....

The only other setback to Anglo-Papal relations was caused by the [1898-1902] Boer War [in South Africa]. Here **the Vatican sympathies lay with the Boers.**....

It was not until the World War of 1914 that it was possible to re-establish official relations with the Holy See, and then for an entirely pragmatic reason. During the first few months of the war, the [all-too-perfidious and sly] British became aware that, because the Entente [*e.g.*, England] had **no relations** with the Holy See, the Central Powers [Austria, Germany, Italy] enjoyed a great advantage, thanks to their well-staffed Embassies at the Vatican. There is much [important “Intelligence”] to be learned at this **sounding-board** of the world; **political as well as ecclesiastical information of all kinds** pours into the Vatican from all over the world. Moreover, whereas **the diplomat of the lay states** comes into contact with only a limited section of the population of the land he is accredited to—the upper and official classes—the **Catholic priests and missionaries move among all classes**, and can report to their bishops every shade of public opinion. (166-168—my emphasis added)

Anthony Rhodes has also given us the memorable and farsighted 1916 words of Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, the Cardinal Secretary of State under Pope Benedict XV. Rhodes introduces to this strategic-cultural matter, as follows, and before quoting Cardinal Gasparri himself directly:

In the peace settlement of 1919 [signed on 28 June 1919—the Treaty of Versailles] **the Pope [Benedict XV] took no part; he had been specifically excluded from it by the victors under the [1915] secret Treaty of London.** However, any **regrets** he may have felt at being unable to exercise the traditional good offices of the Papacy in reconciliation **were soon offset**, once the Peace Conference began, **by his not being involved in the terms [unjustly] imposed on the defeated Central Powers, which the Vatican considered vindictive.** In any case, the Vatican considered that the Conference was opening under most unfavorable auspices, by being held at Versailles instead of in a neutral country such as Holland, at the Peace Palace in The Hague. In the Vatican view, **the choice of a belligerent capital was a psychological error;** and the Conference was **held too soon** after the cessation of hostilities, where Allied

moral law of the Ten Commandments is to the individual, politics are to society. Politics are nothing more than the morals of a society.” (180—my emphasis added) Hence, the Popes' inescapable, enduring involvements in “the *Mixta.*”

hatred of Germany was unabated. Anyway, what could one expect of a Peace Conference dominated by Clemenceau [of France], called “The Tiger”? The Western Allied delegations should not have been totally led by men who had been wartime leaders and in office since 1914. Clemenceau's reference to the “criminal deeds of the Germans” gave the **first** indication that **revenge**, not reconciliation, **dominated the attitude of the Allied leaders, as did the absence of German and Austrian representatives at Versailles. These were only summoned at the very end, when they were presented with a *Diktat*...**

The Vatican also deplored **the dismantlement** of the Austro-Hungarian Empire by the [inordinately harsh] **Trianon terms** [the Trianon Treaty was signed later, on 4 June 1920]. **The danger** to Europe of such an event had been **foreseen as early as 1916** by the Cardinal Secretary of State, Gasparri. The French representative in Rome, M. Gonse, **reported the Cardinal's words at the time** to the French newspaper *Le Journal*, which had referred to “**the likely dissolution of the Habsburg Empire**”:

“Destroy Austria? [exclaimed **Gasparri in 1916**]....My God! What madness! **To what end? To hand it to whom?** Let France and England reflect of the future they will prepare for Europe by such an act. The whirlpool of this terrible war [World War I] will swallow up France too, even if she is victorious, if she does not recognize **the perils which the triumph of the anti-Habsburg coalition will bring to Europe**. Is it possible that France cannot recognize the Russian danger [even in 1916, just before Lenin's 1917 Bolshevik Russian Revolution]? If Austria goes, in a matter of years the Slavs will have swallowed up half Europe [as was to be seen in 1945]. France will lose all influence [even in Poland], and the Catholic religion will be under constant attack in all the countries of Eastern Europe. (246-247—my emphasis added)

If only such men as Cardinal Gasparri and Cardinal Manning had been more formatively attended to! Especially in those abidingly challenging realms of the Church's diplomacy and integrity, given “the morals of society” about us and the Church's own inescapably “overlapping jurisdictions” within “the *Mixta*.”

CODA

On the last pages of his searching and recurrently insightful book, Anthony Rhodes returns to consider Pope Leo XIII and his 1878-1903 Papal Reign. Rhodes' accent on the representative achievements of Leo XIII will also conveniently show us his abiding biases and preferences for concessions and compromises.

Let us in conclusion now look at this last page of Anthony Rhodes' book as we attempt to add a few of our own interlinear or bracketed comments, along with a few reluctant hints and suggestions:

Of the four Popes [Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius X, and Benedict XV] the most successful [sic]—at least in **re-establishing the power of Rome**—was Leo XIII. His great achievement was **to recreate some form of understanding** between Church and State, **after the events of 1870. To this end he was indifferent as to the form of government** which the State **assumed**: monarchy or republic [or revolutionary republic?], democracy or autocracy. Such matters **did not concern the Church** [sic], because the [sacramental, incarnational?] Church is **above** all nations and their governments. The latter he regarded as passing phenomena, imperfect but necessary instruments for the **material** ordinance of human life, ever in the state of flux, changing form, sometimes violently, sometimes peacefully. In the face of this, the Church can **only adopt a waiting attitude**, on the old Vatican [*Cunctator*] principle of *cunctando regitur mundus* [“the world is ruled by a delaying”], **mastery through delay**. Then, **and only then**, when **order** has been **re-established** after the latest political cataclysm, and the new system [sic] appears to be functioning with public support and without undue friction, does the Church recognize it [perhaps through a negotiated Concordat?]. Even then, it knows that it cannot last. Leo XIII did not live to see Mussolini; but he would have understood perfectly how a liberal monarchy could give way to an authoritarian rule which in turn gave way within a few decades to a liberal republic [as in France's “Liberal” Jacobin Third Republic, or in revolutionary Spain and in 1910 in Portugal?].

Novel as his **political** principles [and his tolerantly **indulgent “pastoral” praxis** and his concessively pandering “*Ralliement*” approach to modern society and its secular civilization?] might appear, Leo XIII's **religious** principles were in no way different from those of his predecessors. Almost every word of his [Leo XIII's] Encyclical *Immortale Dei*, on the relations between Church and State, might have been uttered by Innocent III [the Pope from 1198-1216], seven hundred years before. “**Human society,**” it announced, “**cannot dispense with morality, and the basis of morality is religion.** God has divided the government of mankind **between** two [overlapping] powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil, the former placed over things Divine, the latter over human affairs. Since **the Church's end** is nobler, her power extends over all other powers, and **in no way be subject to civil authority.**” The Pope finished with this superb claim: “Wherever the Church of Rome has set her foot, she has straightaway changed **the face of things**, and tempered **the moral tone** of the people with a new civilization, and **with virtues before unknown.** The Catholic Church remains **the light** of which civilization has been at all times **the attendant shadow.** All nations which have yielded to **her sway** have become eminent for their culture, their sense of justice, and the glory of her high deeds.” (251-252—my emphasis added)

Even after this differentiated presentation and tribute, I profess to be rather in the Camp of Pope Leo XIII's immediate predecessor and immediate successor: Pius IX and Pope Saint Pius X. (Perhaps it will still be forgiven me.)

--Finis--

© 2018 Robert D. Hickson