Barbara Rogowska

University of Wrocław

**ATTITUDE OF THE VATICAN TOWARDS THE
AUTHORITARIAN AND TOTALITARIAN STATE
AS SEEN IN THE CHURCH SOCIAL TEACHING**

DOI: 10.2478/ppsr-2020-0008

Author

Dr hab. Barbara I. Rogowska is a political scientist and ethnographer, employed at the Institute of Political Science of the University of Wrocław. Her scientific interests focus on transformations of European political rituals, religious relations in Poland and Europe, history of the communist Poland, political anthropology, organisational, business and corporate cultures and communication strategies, perception management, security policy strategies, especially food security.

ORCID no. 0000-0002-3177-0003**e-mail:** barbara.rogowska@uwr.edu.pl**Abstract**

The attitude of the Church towards the authoritarian and totalitarian state was originally determined by the fact of existence of the Ecclesiastical State. Its downfall contributed to the change in the optics of the papist policy. Leo XIII initiated open realistic policy. He declared the Church's readiness to co-exist (co-operate) with any form of government or social system which would not disturb the essential ecclesiastical tasks. The opinion which won was that the objectives to be attained by the Church were beyond systems and politics. This approach allowed to develop a concept, that evangelization activity should be pursued in any socio-political reality, with adapted methods. Acceptance was granted to those state systems which declared that they would defend of the Church's position, as evidenced by establishment of political relationships between the Holy See and III Reich, fascist Italy, Spain of gen. Franco. On the other hand, the communist (totalitarian) countries were accused of rejecting "the moral norms of co-existence defined by the Church". One can state that the Vatican offered support to those governments or totalitarian and authoritarian states whose internal and foreign policy agreed with the interests of the Church.

During the pontificate of John XXIII, the Church started to express not only willingness to co-operate with each form of government, but also the need to have respect for other philosophies of life, including the leftist ones. As regards economic and political questions, the communist doctrine was not deprecated, unless in its extreme version. However, the doctrinal principles of materialism and programmatic atheism were consistently condemned and negated. Also, the Vatican decided to enter into dialogue with the extreme Left. Certainly, the papacy realised that the communist doctrine and totalitarian state in their very essence were enemies of the Church and religion. True evolution in the attitude towards different forms of governments and states was triggered by the II Vatican Oecumenical Council. While political struggle and discussion were avoided, disputes pertaining to philosophical views on life were undertaken. Agreement of any form was refused when atheism was "administratively succoured".

During the pontificate of Paul VI specific guidelines, principles and rules of procedure were introduced to regulate co-operation with totalitarian communist states. In order to ensure functioning of the Church in totalitarian systems, the Vatican resigned from any polemics as related to capitalism and communism. In turn, the Church demanded from totalitarian regimes to cease imposing the totalitarian world-view on the society. And thus, the Church's fight for the Christian outlook on life was not given up.

Depending on internal and external socio-political situation, and also on the form of the State and

government concerned, the Church defined different conditions indispensable to be satisfied for its successful functioning. The evangelization mission was given superiority.

Keywords: Roman Catholic Church, fascist totalitarianism, communist totalitarianism, ideological offensive, secular state, atheist state, attitude of the Church toward totalitarian regimes, Christian ethics

Attitude of the Vatican towards the authoritarian and totalitarian state as seen in the Church social teaching

The attitude of the Catholic Church's social teaching towards the authoritarian and totalitarian state, especially in the 20th century, raised many controversies in specific political milieus, in the universal Church and local churches. Publication of particular papal encyclicals and specific actions by the Holy See (HS) referring to totalitarian and authoritarian regimes attracted multiple political, ideological, scientific as well as journalistic debates. Different researchers and political milieus have suggested variable interpretations of doctrinal concepts and individual decisions of political or related nature.

This study concerns the reconstruction of the opinion of the Catholic Church's social teaching regarding the authoritarian and totalitarian state and specific policies of such regimes. In this context, a totalitarian regime should be understood as a system of power or political regime based on an ideology which is binding for everybody, with the state controlling the society entirely and striving to supervise all aspects of public and private life, usually through a totalitarian information monopoly of propaganda, terror of political police, and rule of a mass mono-party. An authoritarian regime is a regime of power concentrated with the leader and their closest milieu, usually by subdued institutions of political and public life, such as the parliament, political police, army and censorship system. This regime differs from totalitarianism in that it does not strive to implement total control of all aspects of social life.

The paper analyses social teaching concepts developed by the Church and the Church's political activity towards totalitarian and authoritarian regimes in the universal dimension (referring to policies of the Holy See) and in the local dimension of selected cases. The paper also presents the actual political circumstances and actions taken by the Church in specific countries and their impact on doctrinal concepts and shows how Catholic social teaching has become a function of the Church's interests.

The main objective of the paper is to analyse the Church's position towards totalitarian and authoritarian forms of government, present within Catholic social teaching and political activities. It focuses on the conscious and purposeful process of shaping mutual relations between the Church and totalitarian and authoritarian states, especially regimes who strived to liquidate religion and Church from the public sphere and to remove it from collective memory.

The timeframe that this paper covers is the 20th century, which is a period of deep transformations of regimes, politics and societies. This timeframe allows for observation of the changes in the Church's stance towards various forms of totalitarianisms and authoritarianisms in a historic perspective and for a dynamic approach, too. The paper shows chang-

es in the Church's concepts and actions towards both types of political regimes, depending on the political and legal situation of the universal Church as well as local churches.

The research objectives were achieved through analysis of papal encyclicals referring to assessment of ideological and social-economic tendencies, including *Quanta cura* by Pius IX (1863) along with the *Syllabus*, a series of encyclicals by Leon XII concerning social issues (*Immortale Dei* (1885), *Libertas* (1888), *Rerum novarum* (1891), which concerned social issues in the changing historic circumstances. It is important to note *Quadragesimo anno* (1931) by Pius XI, which condemned the Italian fascist corporatism. Pius XI also issued the encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno* that breaks down the errors of fascism. The pope's warning against socialism and communism can be found in *Divini Redemptoris*. The encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge* condemned National Socialism (Hitlerism). Revolutions in Mexico were condemned in the encyclical *Nos es muy conocida*. Pius XII expressed his opinion on state totalitarianism in his encyclical *Summi pontificatus* (1939) and in the Christmas Eve radio broadcast in 1942. The encyclicals *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in terris* by John XXIII (1961) stressed, among other issues, the crisis of political ideologies followed by rulers (M. Radwan, L. Dyczewski, A. Stanowski, 1996). The documents defended human rights from any form of injustice of any political regime. Unfortunately, there were no references to specific names of regimes, only a statement that some regimes were inhumane or even criminal (M. Debita, 2018, p. 2). Paul VI in *Populorum progressio* noted the totalitarian nature of various political and economic regimes and admitted that the oppressed had a right to a revolution. John Paul II referred to totalitarianism in many encyclicals (*Evangelium vitae*, 20; *Veritatis splendor*, 101).

These subjects are broadly discussed in literature, including publications by representatives of the Catholic social teaching in the 20th century (including M. Pesch, J. Messner, E. Welta, G. Gundlach or J. Hoffner, A. Rauscher). Among the Polish representatives of the Catholic social teaching one should list J. Majka, J. Krucina, J. Kądziela, H. Juros (H. Juros, 1997, pp. 5–35), J. Tischner (Strzeszewski, 1994, p. 6) and R. Zenderowski (Sowiński, Zenderowski, 2002, pp. 5–15). Among totalitarianism researchers in social scientists, one should quote M. Mankowicz, R. Backer and B. Olszewska-Dyoniziak (M. Mankowicz, 1995, pp. 7–17; R. Backer, 1992, pp. 42–68; B. Olszewska-Dyoniziak, 1999, pp. 3–43).

The Church's position towards totalitarianism took shape during the 19th and 20th centuries. Usually, this position confirmed ethical principles, care about the condition of organisation of religious life in particular states and specific values. Degradation of situations of local churches resulted from top-down decisions by states' political authorities.

The study starts with two hypotheses: 1) the Roman Catholic Church in the 20th century developed a flexible concept of its presence in the world; 2) the Church displayed readiness to maintain relations with states of very variable forms of government, including totalitarian and authoritarian ones, provided that they accepted the Church's religious mission.

The following research question should be useful in the study:

1. What doctrinal concepts (social and political ones) were developed by the Church with respect to totalitarian regimes?
2. What political practice was implemented by Vatican and local Churches with respect to totalitarian and authoritarian regimes?

For reconstruction of the Church's position towards the mentioned regimes, the descriptive explanatory method, critical analysis and inductive methods were applied (Wró-

bel, 1992, pp. 10–24) based on analysis of documents issued by the Holy See, including selected encyclicals.

The historic, genetic method was applied to reconstruct the Church's political activity towards particular regimes and changes, which occurred throughout the analysed period. The causal explanation method allowed this research to focus on the correlation between the manner of shaping of the Church's position towards regimes and specific political situations in particular states. The concepts generated by the Holy See and concerning agenda, methods applied and measures taken to take care of the faithful enabled observation of the Church's changing position.

The history of the Church's position towards totalitarian regimes reflects the complex and evolving situation of the universal Church and local churches, as well as believers in particular states. For years, this position was associated with multiple changes in the ideological, legal and political aspects. Particular political groups sometimes defined ideological, political and axiological meanings differently.

The subject of the analysis in the paper is the attitude towards totalitarian and authoritarian regimes in the Catholic social teaching that can be defined as an in-depth reflection on the complex reality of human existence in a society in the light of faith and church tradition. This teaching covers opinions on the moral and religious aspects of social, economic and political life, based on the Christian concept of man and society, which is a part of the Christian doctrine. It refers to theoretical reflection and the Church's social teaching (documents by the Church). Above all, it refers to the Catholic social ethics, formulating norms and social-ethical judgements. This teaching includes theological grounds and indicates moral rules of behaviour for participants of the social life. The subject of the teaching involves people's duties towards groups, as well as the order of institutional structure and social systems. In the philosophical context, the Catholic social teaching is based on ontological objectivism. It develops social rules of personalism, common good, solidarity and subsidiarity. However, it does not define detailed social-economic or political agendas (Pius XI, 1935, p. 14). Its objective is to explain reality through verifying its conformity (or non-conformity) to the Gospel (Zięba, 2008, p. 51).

On the other hand, the scientific exploration of this research refers to the Church's political activity, which can be defined with two approaches. Firstly, according to Canon Law, Catholic clergy is not allowed to take active part in political parties or leading trade unions (Kpk, k. 287, p. 2.). They are forbidden from holding lay posts. However, the Code provides for some exceptions, including political measures (activity) related to defending the Church's rights or development of the common good. The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, *Gaudium et spes*, declared that the Church's mission is universal in nature and it cannot be identified with any political system. It was resolved that political activity is a domain reserved for laymen. Secondly, there is no prohibition of interest and involvement in political issues for the Church and clergy. The Church reserve a right and duty to speak in defence of moral rules in the public and political sphere. "The Church hierarchy is allowed or even obliged to speak (criticise) whenever the basis ethical rules are omitted or human rights are breached in the public life" (Sowiński, 2013, p. 16.; Przeciszowski, 2017, p. 1).

At the turn of the 19th century the Catholic Church had to face two hostile – both politically and ideologically – movements, i.e. liberalism (which developed in the west of Europe) and communism (spreading since 1917 in the eastern part of the continent).

Initially, the Church perceived the danger in the doctrine of liberalism, particularly in its extremist variant, which was bound with advanced consumptionism and lack of ideals or even nihilism. Up until the Second Oecumenical Council, the Vatican had been maintaining the attitude of a “besieged fortress”, defending its state of possession and closed to new intellectual, technical and scientific trends. It is worth remembering that starting from 1870 the national episcopates (based on the ancient 18th- and 19th-century regulations of the state–Church relationship, i.e. Gallicanism, Josephism or Febronism) gave support to the national governments and not to the Holy See. The European world powers (monarchies of enlightened absolutism) treated Church-religious matters instrumentally. The relationships between the state and the Church were characterized by far-reaching etatism. An example of this was forcing on Pope Clement XIV the decision concerning the dissolution of the Jesuit convent (S. Załęski, 1874, pp.1–15). The policy of the Church (understood as papacy) was determined by the existence of the Papal State. The ecclesiastical law was a refuge for feudalism. In the 19th century, it was not only poorly administered and economically weak, but it also was deprived of military-political power. The pope executed two kinds of power, personified by two different authorities: secular and spiritual. A consequence of ruling over an Ecclesiastical or Papal State was the secular policy of the papacy. At the turn of the 19th century, it was quite common among some of the popes to think that the inviolability of the pope’s dominions (Papal State) was a guarantee of fulfilling *sensu stricte* religious ministrations services. Consequences of this secular policy on the Church were lower profits for the Ecclesiastical State in the form of concordat settlements and ensuring the freedom of religious life. The price to be paid was subordination of the papal policy to the imperialistic policy of the rulers of particular world powers. No difference was perceived between the religious-dogmatic principles (which should remain unchanged) and the social-political situation, whose inherent feature is changeability, forcing evolution of forms and means of activity.

From this perspective, subsequent popes were searching both for support from and forms of cooperation with those social-state systems (Z. Zieliński, 2007, p. 12), which constituted a refuge of the principle of restoration – legitimism. The Papal State was conservative. In 1864 the encyclical *Syllabus for Error* was published. In *Syllabus*, pantheism, rationalism, indifferentism, socialism (still in the germinal phase), etatism, the idea of separation of the Church from the state, unlimited freedoms of conscience and religion, publications and press were condemned (M. Wojciechowski, 1995, pp. 8–11).

Syllabus, which contains a list of 80 “mistakes”, was to be a barrier for the Church against liberalism. In this way, the Church was fighting against the ideas of secularization and the equality of worldviews, ideas which had support in liberal circles. It was the final collapse of the Papal State, which brought about the dissolution of the former system of political relations in Europe (the so-called matrimony of the throne and altar), that contributed to the change in the papal optics.

In 1878, Leo XIII initiated open politics. Although it would be hard to call him a liberal, like his predecessors, Leo XIII fought a battle against organizations or institutions independent of the hierarchy of the Church. His aim was to ensure that the Church could pursue unrestricted evangelizational activity. He announced the readiness to acknowl-

edge “any authority” that would create favourable conditions for the ministration and evangelization activity. For instance, Leo XIII ordered French Catholics to support the republican government (J.N. D. Kelly, 1997, pp. 435–438). He declared a willingness to co-exist (co-operate) with state and social systems which would not disturb important tasks of the Church. This approach not only reflects a diametrical change of the papal position but also political realism. What seemed impossible during the pontificate of Pius IX became a reality. Obviously, Leo XIII did not intend to lose influence, hence his disagreement to the formation of Catholic parties or the ban on fighting class repartition, treated as manifestation of the natural order. In the encyclical *Rerum novarum*, the world of labour was defended (by promoting charity), while economic liberalism and the atheist left were fought against. The term “democracy” was introduced into the Catholic dictionary without any negative connotation. Retardation of the activity and views of the Church took place during the pontificate of Pius X, who “in consistorial allocution from 9 November 1903, stated that the pope represents the highest authority in politics as much as in faith and morality” (Z. Zieliński, 2007, p. 26). Finally, the opinion which won was that the Church was to fulfil tasks that were trans-system and ultra-political. This enabled the Church to develop a conception, according to which evangelization should be executed in any socio-political reality, using different methods respectively. On the other hand, it was settled upon that the Vatican ought not to accept any political system, regime or form of government on an exclusive or specific base. Thus, one can state that the Church became pluralistic in the socio-political perspective, having accepted the existence of various ideological and political systems, and ones pertaining to the outlook on life while also having acknowledged the distinctness of cultures.

As the formation of capitalist countries, inspired by liberal doctrine, led to the development of the forms of religious life. Similarly, the development of the tsarist and Soviet Russia initiated the necessity to investigate the possibility of a church organization existing within a socialist system. There would not have been anything unusual about that if it were not for the planned atheism of the communist state. Both systems – capitalism and communism – seemed to represent a hostile attitude towards the Church from the socio-political point of view and that connected with people’s outlook on life. The former propagated liberalism, while the latter propagated materialism. The forms of co-existence or co-operation with the capitalist system had been shaped throughout decades. What is essential is the relationships between a capitalist state and the Church seemed easier to be approved of, considering the consistent propagation of liberalism and pluralism. In a communist country, the programme of atheism strengthened with “hard” etatism must have evoked fears. In capitalist countries, different religions and churches as well as groups, which professed differing or varied ideologies and represented different philosophies of life, could co-exist. In a communist country (USSR) one worldview was obligatory – the materialistic – whereas other outlooks on life were warred with. Thus, during the pontificate of Pius X these state systems were accepted, declaring then that the Church would defend conservative positions (Z. Zieliński, 2007, p. 29).

Now and then, this practice served to account for the fact that the Apostle See established political relationships with the Third Reich and Fascist Italy. In 1929, a Lateran Treaty was signed between the Holy See and the fascist Italian government. Historians of the Catholic Church explain this as resulting from the fascist governments’ declared attitude contrary to the left, and their declarations to liquidate political pluralism (disso-

lution of political parties, authoritarian rulership). The Church's gain was a very beneficial concordat. The Holy See also signed with the Third Reich a concordat in 1933, accepting a one-party political system. It is thus clear that in the first half of the 20th century, the Vatican had more confidence in strong anti-democratic authorities than for weak pluralistic and democratic ones. Democratic regimes were still regarded in Rome as powerless and unstable since they depended on their parliaments and hence they did not ensure a stable situation for the functioning of the Church. Additionally, the Church was still afraid that the ideas of freedom might come into reality and that other orientations or worldviews might attain equality of rights.

The experiences of World War II demonstrated the impermanence of political systems and regimes, not only democratic but also undemocratic ones. The consequences of totalitarian ideology (fascism) were noticed. The result was the acceptance of the idea of solidarity of people representing different races, nations and religions, different origin and social status, as this was the only possible way to save what had proved to be of utmost importance – protection of life and human dignity. Obviously, the idea of oecumenism was slowly developing in the Church. According to Z. Zieliński (2007, p.32), the stiff pontifical ceremonial of Pius XII “did not make the Church closer to the everyday life but more and more remote from it”. In the times of John XXIII, the Church accepted pluralism “as a sanctioned form of human existence”. A consequence of this change of position was acceptance of any variant of the state's development, and thus different forms of government and political systems. Starting from the Second Vatican Oecumenical Council, the attributes of rulership were given up (of the power and authority based on earthly possessions) by the Church in favour of a focus on poverty and the rejection and exclusion of individuals, races and nations.

In the 19th century, during the battles for an independent Italy, the Holy See defended the Church State, a state which in socio-political (governmental, systemic) practice could be defined as a Catholic concept, a theocratic and extremely conservative conception. It was a state governed in accordance with the rules of absolutism (D. Tanalski, 1984, pp. 150–187). Leo XIII was slowly renouncing the theocratic vision of state. This pope was the first to confer full sovereignty on the state, whereas the Church was assigned supreme authority with respect to the philosophy of life. A conclusion can thus be drawn that he did not approve the complete separation of the Church from the state. Leo XIII accepted the idea of freedom understood as a right to choose, but the choice had to be made towards the good. Thus, he accepted the idea of liberty in a political system as far as the system itself did not infringe on the principles of Christianity. He rejected the concepts of freedom of conscience and religion understood as absolute freedom. An ideal for this particular pope was a denominational state, even though he allowed the existence of a multi-denomination state, i.e., one that would leave complete freedom of religious practice to the Church. In this conception, subjection to the state authority was declared if the authority did not violate “God's commandments”. Acceptance was given to a new, non-monarchic form of government – democratic (J. Orlandis, 2007, s. 37). In the encyclical *Rerum novarum*, Leo XIII expressed his negative opinion about the Marxist doctrine, refusing to agree to collectivization of goods and liquidation of private property. In the encyclical *Graves de communi*, he did not consent to the combining of Christian democracy with socialism. Displaying willingness to co-operate with the republic (any form of rulership, which is both authoritarian and totalitarian), he opposed separation of the Church from the state.

One can state that the 20th-century Church elaborated a flexible conception justifying its presence in the world. It was ready to establish relationships with countries of widely different forms of government. The condition, however, was acceptance of the religious mission of the Church.

To show the attitude of the Church towards the totalitarian and authoritarian forms of government, one should consider doctrinal (socio-political) conceptions and the political practice pursued by the Vatican and local churches.

Of course, the Church created its own conception of a state and a model of acceptable economic structure. It was a denominational state bound with the corporational system and the class-professional structure (E. Rafalski, 1978, pp. 25–37). This conception was valid until the Second Vatican Council.

As already mentioned, in the encyclical *Immortale Dei* from 19 November 1885, Leo XIII argued that each form of government could be guided by *evangelic principia* (Z. Zieliński, 2007, pp. 226–227). However, he did not accept the ideals of the Enlightenment. This pope assumed the necessity that all citizens ought to be subordinated to the principles of Christianity. The ideal of the Leonian political doctrine was a denominational state. Leo XIII appreciated the theory of a class society. In the encyclical *Quo apostolici muneris* from 28 December 1878, he expressed a negative opinion about socialists, calling them a sect. He regarded the left as a socially harmful, nihilistic and anarchistic movement. Leo XIII condemned the revolutionary conceptions of the communist movement, seeing no possibility of cooperation. Also an integralist Pius X reckoned rationalists, materialists and the entire left as enemies of the Church and their governments as “godless” and indifferent (Z. Zieliński, 2007, pp. 268–274). He accepted exclusively the socio-political order as proclaimed by the Church. Benedict XV, and later Pius XII, would behave in a similar way. He would declare his sympathy to the casualties of World War II, yet not daring to condemn Nazi Germany (Z. Zieliński, 2007, p. 321). He declared his acceptance of any form of government. The exception was the communist government of the USSR. The changes introduced by the first communist country, such as the separation of the Church from the state, the secularization of schools and the confiscation of the Church property, could not be expected to receive the pope’s acceptance. In the encyclicals *Quadragesimo Anno* and *Divini Redemptoris* (Pius XI, 2002, p.1–52), Benedict XV’s successor, Pius XI, criticized the ideological and social assumptions of the communist trend. He deprecated communism, its anti-religiousness (godlessness), the theory of class struggle and its vision of total transformation of the system. This pope did not trust in the interference of the state in the socio-economic realm. He regarded both extreme individualism (so typical of the liberal doctrine of a capitalist country) and extreme collectivism (the typical form of possession developing in the USSR) as dangerous. He considered the communist doctrine as false, as much as the ideal of justice, equality and brotherhood. Pius XI maintained that the communist movement “deprived man of freedom”, for it rejected any superiority and any authority imposed by God. In his opinion, “communism is bad in its very essence and anyone who wants to save the Christian civilization cannot co-operate with it in any field”. Pius XI accused communism of rejecting “the moral norms of co-existence defined by the Church” (Pius XI, 2002, pp.1–52). He postulated fighting the secular class communist movement.

However, as demonstrated by his political activity, in spite of criticizing the communist state and its doctrine, Pius XI aimed at entering into a co-operation with Soviet Russia. On the plane of actual policy, the Vatican proved to be pragmatic. Counting on im-

provement of the situation of Catholics in Russia (USSR), the pope was even ready to make an agreement with the ideologically unaccepted communist nation. Attempts at initiating dialogue were consistently undertaken. In February 1922, Pius XI spoke about communism as not being in conflict with Christianity in the respect of politics and economy. The Church demanded from USSR authorities only the freedom of religious cult, a guaranteed possibility of professing the Catholic faith (Z. Zieliński, 2007, pp. 341–342). However, neither party decided to be the first to accept the conditions of the opposite side. Consequently, the ecclesiastical circles realized how hostile the system was towards any religion, whereas the communist nation commenced its offensive against the Church's philosophy of life and liquidating church organizations.

The position of the Holy See as related to other totalitarian regimes was quite different. It was not only that in the conceptions of a fascist state the Church saw an anti-communist approach, but also this particular regime seemed to correlate with the Church doctrine of a corporational state. The agreement with the strong fascist government – independent of the unstable parliament majority – was to guarantee safe relations between the state and the Church. The fascist government's assurance of fighting the left and liberal groups was not without importance. The more so that they personified the two doctrinal and political enemies – materialism and liberalism or, from economic perspective, communism and capitalism. A conclusion can be drawn that the Church gave support to those governments and countries whose internal and foreign affairs policy was in agreement with the Church's interests and its socio-political doctrine. In 1936 Germany and Japan signed the Anti-Comintern Pact (Comintern = International Organization of Communist Parties). Italy joined the pact in 1937. From time to time Pius XI expressed his objections with regard to the internal policy practices of the fascist countries, but mainly on those instances when the Church's position and influence were endangered. Prompted by the above mentioned reasons, Pius XI approved of the fascism regime in Italy. On 20 December 1926, he stated that "Benito Mussolini is a man sent by God, [...] who rules the country with unmatched power and freshness of spirit."

The fascist government displayed a far-reaching "understanding" of the Church's needs – to such an extent that for tactical purposes hostile opinions concerning the Church, which were present within the party, were removed from public announcements. The relationships between the government of Mussolini and the Vatican were so good that even the pope's demand for the restitution of the smallest Papal State, which was to ensure sovereignty to the Church, was satisfied. On 11 February 1929, the papacy acknowledged the formation of Vatican City (*Città del Vaticano*), covering 44 hectares. On the same day, the Lateran agreements were signed, establishing the legal status of the pope in Rome, the concordat and a financial convention. Such were the favours received by the Church from the fascist dictatorship. Hence, it is not surprising that the Vatican had certain trust in this type of government. These governments not only declared but also signed agreements that guaranteed the Church freedom to pursue its mission. The concordat was profitable for the Church. In the light of national law, religion was becoming "the conviction of the nation and country", the state financed the Church, and, what is more, the national legislation was to comply with the canonic law. The Church attained full freedom. The price for these conveniences and concessions was resignation from political activity. Yet, the government assured that Catholic organizations would preserve their status if they limit themselves to purely religious tasks. This condition involved certain danger: the fascist

government could restrict the Church's public activity. In a legal-political sense, fascist Italy became a Catholic country. One can say that it represented the idea of a state that was the closest to the Church – a denominational state.

The treaty between the Holy See and fascist Italy certainly served the Church as an example of the regulation of relations with Germany. Initially, of course, the ideology of National Socialism was not accepted by the Vatican due to its exaggerated nationalism and rejection of the Christian tradition. In addition, the elements of racist theory were unacceptable, like the conception with a view to create a Catholic national church. Hitler's ideas as the chief of the party raised doubts of the Vatican (eds. K. Gotto and K. Repgena, 1983, p. 21; R. Morsey, 2005, pp. 101–138). Thus, the German Church seemed to be insusceptible to "the rapture over the leader". However, the moment Hitler became the German chancellor the Church changed its attitude towards him. In accordance with the traditional Catholic teaching about the country, Hitler began to be treated as a state-building power and a legally valid, superior authority to whom the citizens owed obedience (L. Volk, 1975, pp. 305–325; U. von Hel, 1975, pp. 55). The Church was interested in the regulation of ecclesiastical matters, while the Nazis needed prestige in international opinion. The concordat, signed on 20 July 1933, represented the first international legal act negotiated with the Third Reich (E. J. Pałysa, 1978, pp. 2–14; eds. K. Gotto and K. Repgena, Wyd. ODSS, Warszawa 1983, p. 68). It created morally-political and formally-legal potential premises for acceptance of the fascist-Hitlerite rulership. This concordat was advantageous to the Church, ensuring complete freedom of activity in the religious realm. The price for the benefits was resignation of clergymen and religious associations from any political endeavours. What is more, organizations which were to make a bridge between Catholicism and the Nazi movement, such as *Bund Katolischer Deutscher "Kreuz und Adler"* ("Cross and Eagle" Association of Catholic Germans), were even created. In actuality, the Nazis regularly broke this concordat. They weakened the Church's influence in the circles of youth, teachers and children and repressed priests. Pius XI decided to publish the encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge* that was critical about the practice of the Hitlerite policy. He condemned the totalitarian fascist country. However, he did not negate the principles according to which it had been developed. In 1928, Pius XI unequivocally condemned racism and anti-Judaism; (Burchard van Schewick, *The Catholic Church vs. national-socialist racial policy*; eds. K. Gotto and K. Repgena, Wyd. ODSS, Warszawa 1983, p. 72; R. Lill, in: K. H. Rengstorf, S. v. Kortzfleisch, 1968 pp. 227–235). In this plane, the Church preserved its neutral position, keeping out of political matters, only pointing out to Catholics the perversions of Hitlerism in respect of faith and the principles of Catholic ethics (E. Rafalski, pp. 13, 17, 45–50; Z. Zieliński, pp. 346–348, 355–370). The experience provided by the collaboration with Hitlerite Germany showed that, when in contact with a totalitarian country, one cannot count on compliance with the law or agreements. In spite of that, the Vatican collaborated with other totalitarian countries. An example can be the co-operation with Portugal under Antonio Salazar. The Portuguese constitution of 1931 guaranteed freedom of all religious denominations. In this country, Catholicism was given the status of the main religion. In Spain, a country historically associated with Catholicism, the Church was ready to approve of the new, republican form of government. Yet, the condition was respect for the ecclesiastical law. One should admit, however, that in the countries of Catholic majority (e.g. Spain) the Vatican rather protested against legal guarantees of liberty out of conscience for different religions, whereas in those where

Catholics represented a minority the Church demanded from the authorities the freedom of religious cult. The Vatican did not consent to the separation of the Church from the state in Spain due from their standpoint that this was mostly a Catholic country. The anti-Church law and repression of clergymen contributed to the Church proclaiming in favour of General Francisco Franco.

During the pontificate of Pius XII, the Vatican's attitude toward totalitarian countries proved to be ambiguous. The racist doctrine of the Third Reich was then quite cautiously criticized. He was reprimanded for this by the Third Reich's Ministry of Propaganda (D. Albrecht, 1976, pp.23–56). Never, however, did the pope condemn the Hitlerite regime (F. Ryszka, 1975, pp. 34–120; Z. Zieliński, (2), 1980, pp. 1–27; Z. Zieliński, 2007, pp. 381–391). He explained, "We do not pronounce against the German Reich nor against any form of government [...]. Each nation has the right to decide about the form of government. [...] It is not an affair of the Church to take a standpoint with respect to purely mundane matters or express opinion as regards to different systems and methods that could be used when seeking solutions for urgent questions of the current moment" (F. Ryszka, 1975, pp.123–220; Z. Zieliński (2), 1980, pp. 1–27; Z. Zieliński, 2007, pp. 381–391). Such an approach was a consequence of the Church's teaching that was in force, which assumed faithfulness to the country irrespective of its "appropriate conduct". During the Second World War, Pius XII distinguished the differences between political and moral neutrality. As necessary, he supported abiding by political neutrality, which was evidenced by the lack of condemnation of any action or country (for instance, the "Axis" countries or the USSR). In his opinion, Nazism and Bolshevism were equally dangerous. On the other hand, in unofficial pronouncements he made a distinction between totalitarian and democratic world powers, inclining towards democratic representation regimes. He was a mediator in the establishment of relationships between Germany and the British government. He supported humanitarian assistance to citizens of the USSR as a member of the anti-Hitlerite/Nazi coalition, and he refused to acknowledge the German-Russian war as an anti-Bolshevism crusade (D. Albrecht, 1968, pp. 32–42; K. Gotto, H., Gunter Hockerts, K. Reppen, 1968, pp. 85–98; B. van Schewick, 1968, pp. 83–84; L. Volk, 1975, p. 52).

The Church's post-war political practice indicates that the papacy accepted each form of government, which was contradictory to the Marxist and lay conceptions. The change of attitude towards totalitarianisms from neutral (during World War II) to engaged was explained by the endangerment of the world's order by communism. The decree of the Holy Office from 1 July 1949 was to be dictated by the concern about the high population of Catholics in the eastern bloc countries. Under penalty of excommunication, the decree forbade Catholics to affiliate with parties of materialistic or anti-Christian character. Such activity was acknowledged as defection from the faith. Earlier, Pius IX issued a decree, *Non Expedit*, in 1874, which forbade Italian Catholics to participate in the political activity of the Kingdom of Italy. This was a reaction of the pope to the confiscation of ecclesiastical properties by the young Italian state. The decree was repealed in 1919 by Benedict XV. Of course, the communist ideology was condemned, especially in its Russian version, and Marxism discredited.

During the Cold War there were no contacts between the Holy See and socialist countries (Z. Zieliński, 2007, pp. 398–399). Yet, the Church sought dialogue with the USSR. Pius XII formulated the so-called minimalist programme of liberties for Catholics. It comprised the freedom of faith and freedom of religious conviction. The communist au-

thority did not intend to satisfy this requirement. On the other hand, the Vatican refused (although indirectly) to recognize the Soviet Union, counting on the possibility of change of government accompanied by the transformation of the national denominational policy.

The attitude of Pius XII towards the Spanish authoritarian rule of General Francisco Franco was different. It was more of the character of symbiosis between the Vatican and the authoritarian state. In the apostolic constitution, *Hispaniarum fidelitas*, from 5 August 1953, Franco was bestowed the title of honour – the protocanon of the basilica of the Virgin Mary Major in Rome. The two sides signed a concordat in 1953. Catholicism became a state religion (J. Orlandis, 2007, pp.124–125.), turning Spain into a denominational state. In Franconian Spain, starting from 1941, the state had a great influence on filling the ecclesiastical posts, and non-consistorial benefices from 1946.

During the pontificate of John XXIII, until the Second Vatican Council, the position of the Church was consistently anti-communist and anti-Soviet. Nevertheless, from the beginning not only was willingness to co-operate with any form of government expressed, but also the need to have regard for other opinions, including the leftist, was encouraged. The pope restrained himself from condemnation of the communist doctrine as it concerned economic and political questions. As far as the economic structure is concerned, John XXIII inclined to the far-reaching national interventionism and claims of individuals to the society (Z. Zieliński, 2007, pp. 423, 424, 427, 429, 430, 432, 439). John XXIII was not concerned with the details of the forms of government. He agreed to the existence of collective forms. Thus, this particular pope went beyond the hitherto inculcated ancillary ideas such as charity and alms.

John XXIII consistently negated the doctrinal basics of materialism, which is the main philosophy of atheism. Yet, unlike his predecessors, he announced readiness to enter into dialogue with the extreme left. He justified this decision with the reasons of Christian ethics. He expressed a conviction that conversation with communists would weaken the atheist worldview. He was aiming for activation of the oecumenical movement, perceiving it as a means to oppose the atheistic conceptions. He demanded that the communist government would guarantee that believers would be given individual liberty as well as the freedom of conscience and religious persuasion. The pope recommended not to identify false philosophical doctrines (of Marxism, for instance) with historical and political movements. In his opinion, dialogue was possible with the latter, whereas it would be difficult to agree with the philosophical doctrines (J. Orlandis, 2007, p. 39). The continuator of the work of John XXIII was Paul VI. In order to ensure the functioning of the Church in different systems, he resigned from any polemics with respect to political systems alien to Church thought, which were capitalism and communism. On the contrary, he pointed out to the pro-state impact of the Church on society in the moral dimension. He argued that Catholic ethics did not impose onto the faithful “Catholic” opinions from a political or socio-economic standpoint. This approach was reflected in the encyclicals *Populorum progressio* and *Octogesima adveniens*. Paul VI was seeking for the Church a place in the contemporary world. However, he retained for himself the possibility of intervention in state matters when God’s law was violated, irrespective of who the offender was. He even permitted revolutions as a means of last resort to dissolve suppression and put down injustice. John XXIII tried to eliminate the involvement of the Church with any side of a political bloc or system, and not only verbally. He confirmed that Catholicism was not colliding with political systems, but that faith should independently be considered, indicating the

potential of Catholics to adapt to any culture and the universal character of the religion, which had no political objectives (D. Tanalski, 1984, pp. 212–250; Z. Zieliński, 2007, p. 477). With regard to communist, totalitarian and atheist states, John XXIII avoided political fighting or polemics, although he willingly undertook intellectual struggle concerning the philosophy of life.

The Second Vatican Council did not condemn communism as either a political formation or a philosophical doctrine pertaining to the outlook on life (Z. Zieliński, 2007, p. 458). Additionally, a dialogue with the so-called philosophical atheism was allowed. Agreement was refused only on those instances when atheism was “administratively succoured” when it was fighting religion or forcing dramatic choices on people. At the time when the Second Vatican Council was held, the pope recommended The Jesus Association to wage a battle against the danger of atheism. Thus, not only were studies on the nature of atheism started, but also forms of activity with the aim to oppose atheism were developed. A religious means of propagandist function were certainly prayers for Churches in atheist countries and everywhere where religious freedom was undermined. It is thus clearly visible what significant evolution the Vatican went through in its attitudes towards Enlightenment ideas, and particularly in the position pertaining to totalitarian states of the communist type. Of course, the Church did not give up the fight concerning the outlook on life, preaching everywhere that atheism destroys both individuals and whole societies.

In the evangelizational constitution *On the Church in the contemporary world*, the principles of co-existence of Catholicism with different political, economic and social systems, and with systems concerning the philosophy of life, were defined. Paul VI was the pope who transformed the Church’s earlier offer of co-operation with any form of government into concrete guidelines, principles and rules of procedure. An institutional dimension of entering into dialogue with atheists, or communists, was the establishment of the organ of the Vatican Secretary for the Irreligious. On 8 April 1965, the Secretarial Office was established. This readiness of Catholics to co-operate with the left was generated by the unnormalized situation of the Church in the countries of the socialist bloc. The condition for co-operation was satisfying of the demand that the communist regimes ceased using pressure to impose their totalitarian system’s outlook on life on their societies.

The eastern bloc had the character of totalitarian, dictatorial, anti-religious regimes inspired by the Marxist ideology. The Churches in the countries falling within the bloc bore the name of the so-called “silence churches”. They suffered repression – initially, in the Stalinist period, brutal physical repression and later under an administrative and police nature. Undoubtedly, certain political perspectives affected the attitude of the Vatican towards communist countries in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Therefore, in Vatican circles, a scenario was taken into account that Italy and France, in which communist parties enjoyed wide support from their societies, might fall within the orb of the USSR’s influence. Paul VI faced a dilemma of whether to return to the policy of his predecessors (freezing of the contacts) or to start negotiations with the communist regime. The so-called “Ostpolitik” (“eastern politics”, an analogy to the Hitlerite eastern politics) was chosen. The first series of visits to the Vatican were paid in 1967 by the USSR president Nikolai Podgórny, then in 1973 by the Yugoslavian leader Josif Bros Tito, followed by Nicolae Ceausescu from Romania. In 1974 the Vatican was visited by the USSR minister of foreign affairs Andrei Gromyko. The first secretaries of the Communist parties of Hungary (János Kádár) and Poland (Edward Gierek) visited the Vatican that same year. The

communist authorities used the warming of the relationships with the Vatican for propagandist purposes. The Vatican quickly established a relationship with Yugoslavia, possibly because Tito pursued sovereign foreign policy independence of the USSR. The diplomatic relationships with Yugoslavia were established in 1966. A partial agreement with Hungary was signed in 1964. In 1972 the Vatican withdrew its support for the Polish Immigration Government in London. The Vatican granted the Polish church complete freedom of activity, for which the latter obliged itself to remain apolitical.

The transformations that the Church had undergone echoed positively in the relationships with communist countries. However, a negative relationship was experienced with contacts in Spain during the 1960s. Certainly, the Franco regime had already started to be an outdated form of state administration. Besides, the change to the relationships was triggered by the resolutions of the Second Vatican Council. Another reason was the negative attitude of Paul VI towards fascism. The Church began to get detached from the authoritarian state in 1968, intending to make corrections to the concordat in order for it to be compliant with the contemporary ecclesiastical thought of the Church, and especially with the declaration *Dignitatis Humanae*. After Franco's death (1975), the concordat of 1953 was annulled. On 6 December 1978, a new Spanish constitution was passed, which ultimately removed the notation about the traditional denominationalism of the country in favour of religious neutrality of the state and at the costs of liquidation of many of the privileges formerly received by the Church. Catholicism ceased to be the state religion. The country became secular and all religions acquired equal rights. The Vatican was slowly getting ready to acknowledge democracy as the most proper form of government.

The activation of contacts between European socialist countries and the Vatican did not extend to all totalitarian regimes globally. In China, the confrontation of the atheist ideology with the religious worldview probably assumed the sharpest forms. The Chinese communists made use of the traditional teaching of the Church for the development of a Catholic Chinese national church. The Vatican, with an intention to prevent acknowledgement by the Chinese government of the subordination of this new Church to Rome as a national treachery, declared that there was no conflict between Catholicism and obligations to the nation, country or government. Ultimately, in the fear that the repression towards the Church in China might be strengthened, the Vatican adopted the tactics of silence.

In Chile, The Christians for the Benefit of Socialism Movement appeared, which represented an attempt to reconcile the Christian religious conviction with Marxist ideology.

During the pontificate of John Paul II, the Church fought against atheism, condemning the absolutism of the philosophy of life that was nursed in communist countries. The pope showed an unyielding attitude towards communist authority, preparing an ideological offensive against atheist ideology. An element of the ideological battle he went into was consecration of twenty-seven martyrs of totalitarian regimes.

It was also during this period that the disintegration of the communist bloc took place. The Vatican started to establish diplomatic relations with the former member (communist) countries, such as with Russia on 15 March 1990. In 1996, the leader of communist Cuba, Fidel Castro, visited the Vatican, and in 1998 the pope set off on a pilgrimage to Cuba. In 1997, the Vatican entered into diplomatic relationships with Muammar Gaddafi's Libya. Also, the pope signed an agreement in Nicaragua with the communist regime of Daniel Ortega.

The Church has consistently been fighting totalitarianism in respect of the philosophy of life – which is atheism. The Church saw it was responsible for elimination of conscience from the social life, leading to moral disaster. According to Church teaching, the atheistic outlook on life is false as much as liberalism. For John Paul II, the ideal in the ideological offensive is a neutral state. This pope distinguished between the technique of ruling, in which the Church should not partake, from the principles the authority it is guided by. In his opinion, the principles are the question of ethics, and therefore the Church is obliged to express its opinion in this matter. In general, however, the Church has rejected the idea of an atheist state, as it does not take into account the natural laws. In addition, Benedict XVI maintained that atheism is an effect of resignation from the truth, which is replaced by the ideas of tolerance and absolute liberty.

The Church's objective is incessant realization of the Christian moral code, in each possible political system and under any form of government. The condition is still compliance with the rights of a human being. Currently, the Vatican assumes a favorable attitude towards political pluralism by accepting the democratic system. By criticizing totalitarian systems, the Church is, however, able to notice also the shortcomings of the democratic system. The Church has assigned to itself the role of distinguishing good from evil, and the right to name these categories unequivocally. At times the Church happens to be "a nuisance", both to totalitarianisms (not only of communist nature) and to liberal capitalism due to the postulates of obedience to the Christian ethical principles.

As illustrated above, authoritarianism and totalitarianism have been accepted by the Vatican if they provided conditions for the Church to pursue undisturbed evangelization and ministration activity.

The attitude of the Church towards the authoritarian and totalitarian state was originally determined by the fact of the existence of the Ecclesiastical State. Its downfall contributed to the change in the optics of the papist policy. Leo XIII initiated an open, realistic policy. He declared readiness to co-exist (co-operate) with any form of government or social system that would not disturb the essential ecclesiastical tasks. The opinion which won was that the objectives to be attained by the Church were trans-system and ultra-political. This approach allowed the Church to elaborate on a conception, according to which evangelization activity should be pursued in any socio-political reality, to which methods ought to be respectively adopted. Thus, the Church accepted state systems that defended the Church's position, which could be illustrated by the establishment of political relationships between the Holy See and the Third Reich, fascist Italy, and Spain under General Franco. On the other hand, communist (totalitarian) countries were accused of rejecting "the moral norms of co-existence defined by the Church". One can state that the Vatican offered support to those governments or totalitarian and authoritarian states whose internal and foreign policy agreed with the interests of the Church.

During the pontificate of John XXIII, not only was the willingness to co-operate with each form of government expressed but also the need to have respect for other philosophies of life, including of leftists. As regards to economic and political questions, the communist doctrine was not deprecated, unless in its extreme version. However, the doctrinal principles of materialism and programme atheism were consistently condemned and negated. The Vatican decided to enter into dialogue with the extreme left. Certainly, the papacy realized that the communist doctrine and totalitarian state in their very essence are enemies of the Church and religion. The Second Vatican Oecumenical Council

triggered the change in attitude towards different forms of governments and states. While political battles and discussions were avoided, disputes pertaining to the outlook on life were undertaken. The Church refused agreement of any form when atheism was “administratively succoured”.

During the pontificate of Paul VI, concrete guidelines, principles and rules of procedure were introduced to regulate co-operation with totalitarian, communist states. In order to ensure the functioning of the Church in totalitarian systems, the Vatican resigned from any polemics as related to capitalism and communism. In turn, the Church demanded for totalitarian regimes to cease imposing the totalitarian worldview on society. Thus, the Church’s fight for the Christian outlook on life was not abandoned.

Depending on internal and external socio-political situations, and on the form of the state and government concerned, the Church defined different conditions indispensable to be satisfied for its successful functioning. The evangelization mission was given superiority.

Summary

The Church has gone through a specific evolution both in terms of the developed concepts of the Catholic social teaching and the accepted political practice. It can be said that the particular reality in different states governed by various totalitarian and authoritarian regimes enabled the development of an open concept that declared no contradiction between Catholicism and an obligation towards the nation, state or political system. For instance, striving to dismiss the Chinese government’s recognition of submission to Rome as national treason, the Vatican declared that there is no contradiction between Catholicism and obligations towards the nation, state or political system. The Vatican’s Second Council did not condemn communism as a political formation or philosophical doctrine (Zieliński, 1980, p. 458). Furthermore, dialogue with so-called philosophical atheism was accepted. Agreement was denied only in situations of “administrative support” for atheism that would produce a struggle against religion and force people to make dramatic choices. During the Council, the pope ordered the Society of Jesus to fight against the danger of atheism. Therefore, studies on the nature of atheism and the development of forms of action to oppose and fight atheism were initiated. The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World defined the rules of co-existence of Catholicism with various political, economic, social and philosophical systems. Thus, Paul VI was the pope who transformed the previous offer of the Church’s cooperation with any form of government into specific guidelines, principles and rules of action. The institutional dimension of the initiated dialogue with atheists and communists involved the establishment of an organ of the Secretariat for Non-Believers. This readiness for cooperation between Catholics and the left was generated by various circumstances, including, for example, a non-regulated position of churches within the socialist bloc. The Church postulated also that communist regimes should cease to apply totalitarian pressure in worldviews as a condition for cooperation. A religious intervention of a propagandist nature certainly involved praying for Churches in atheist states and anywhere where freedom of religion was questioned. Thus, it can be observed that the Church evolved significantly in its position towards the ideas of the Enlightenment, and especially towards totalitarian states of communist type. Of course, it never waived its philosophical and ideological struggle. It

taught everywhere that atheism destroys individuals and societies. The quoted examples show that, on certain conditions, the Church tolerated authoritarianism and totalitarianism if they respected its activity.

References

- Albrecht D., The Holy See and the III Reich [Stolica święta i Trzecia Rzesza], in: The Church 1 Catholics, national socialism, joint paper/work/publication, eds. K. Gotto and K. Repgena, Wyd. ODSS, Warszawa 1983.
- Backer R., Totalitaryzm, Geneza, istota, upadek, Index-Books, Toruń 1992.
- Canon Law, 1984.
- Debita M., Nauka Społeczna Kościoła Katolickiego-wybrane zagadnienia, w: prawo.uni.wroc.pl, [20.11.2018].
- Radwan M., Dyczewski L., Stanowski A. (ed.), Dokumenty nauki społecznej Kościoła, vol. 1–2, Rzym-Lublin 1996.
- Encyklika "O położeniu Kościoła w Rzeszy Niemieckiej" (Mit brennender Sorge), 14.03.1937, 4.
- Gotto K., Gunter Hockerts H., Reppen K. (eds), National-socialist challenge and the reply of the Church. Recapitulation, in: The Church Catholics, national socialism, joint paper/work/publication, eds. K. Gotto and K. Repgena, Wyd. ODSS, Warszawa 1983.
- Hel U.v., Catholics in the III Reich in: Volk L., The German episcopate and the III Reich, in: The Church, MAINZ 1975.
- The Holy See as a participant of international political relationships, Wyd. COMSNP, Warszawa 1978.
- Juros H., Kościół, kultura, Europa. Katolicka nauka społeczna wobec współczesności, Lublin-Warszawa 1997.
- Kelly J.N.D., Encyklopedia papieży, Warszawa, PIW, 1997.
- Lill R., Rengstorf K.H., v. Kortzfleisch S., The Church and the Synagogue II [Kirche und Synagoge II].Stuttgart 1968.
- Mankowicz M., Kulisy totalitaryzmu, PiT, Kraków 1995.
- Morsey R., The Catholic minority and emergence of national socialism, in: The Church, in: Łódzkie Studia Teologiczne nr 14, Łódź 2005.
- Olszewska-Dyoniziak B., Antropologia totalitaryzmu europejskiego XX wieku, Atla 2, Wrocław 1999.
- Orlandis J., The Catholic Church in the 2nd half of the 20th century, Polish edition of Wen-cyklop. POLWEN, Radom 2007
- Pałysa E.J., Wprowadzenie, w: Kongresy eucharystyczne w Polsce i za granicą, Warszawa 1987
- Pius XI, Encyclical *Divini Redemptoris*, Encyclicals on Godless communism of 19 March 1937), Wyd. PKAP, Warszawa 1937, *Te Deum* Warszawa 2002.
- Rafalski E. (2), Ogólnokrajowe kongresy eucharystyczne w Polsce, w: Kongresy eucharystyczne w Polsce i za granicą, Warszawa 1987.
- Rafalski E., The Vatican's policy on the eve of World War II (against the main diplomatic actions), PWN, Warszawa 1978.
- Rengstorf K. H., Kortzfleisch S. v., The Church and the Synagogue II [Kirche und Synagoge II], Stuttgart 1968.

- Ryszka F., *At the source of success and failure. Sketches from the history of Hitlerism*, Warszawa 1975.
- Skrzeszewski Cz., *Katolicka nauka społeczna*, Warszawa 1994.
- Sowiński S. (ed.), *Obecność Kościoła katolickiego w sferze publicznej demokratycznego państwa prawa. Przykład współczesnej Polski*, Warszawa 2013, politologia.uksw.edu.pl/uploads/raport2pdf.
- Księża i polityka, w: <https://pl.aleteia.org/2017/06/13/ksiezaipolityka> [27.11.2018].
- Sowiński S., Zenderowski R., *Europa drogą Kościoła. Jan Paweł o Europie i europejskości*, Wyd. Ossolineum Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 2002/03.
- Tanalski D. (eds), *Ideological tendencies in the contemporary Catholic social and philosophical thinking/thought, joint paper/work/publication*, , Wyd. Książka i Wiedza 1984
- Volk L., *The German episcopate and the III Reich*, in: *The Church*, MAINZ 1975
- Wojciechowski M., *Syllabus of Error, Powściągliwość i Praca* nr 10 1995
- Wróbel S., *Funkcjonalistyczne koncepcje dynamiki politycznej. Proces i zmiana polityczna*, Katowice 1992.
- Załęski S., *Historia zniesienia Zakonu Jezuitów I jego zachowanie na Białej Rusi*, t.1 Lwów 1874.
- Zieliński Z., *Papacy/papestry and popes of the last two centuries*, Wyd. Poznańskie, Poznań 2007.
- Zieliński Z. (2), *Religion in the national-socialist conception of society*, in: "A Christian in the world", no 91–92, 1980.
- Zięba M., *Papieże i kapitalizm*, Wyd. Znak, Kraków 2008.