

THE POLITICAL DEATH OF THE ROMAN PAPACY MARKED BY SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

**Dr. Alberto R. Treiyer
June 2019**

The struggle for world dominion between the religious and secular powers has not reached an end. This is the conclusion of David I. Kertzer, the author of a new book entitled, *The Pope who would be King. The exile of Pius IX and the Emergence of Modern Europe* (2018). This is why Kertzer has written about the history which marked the papal loss of the Pontifical States in the second half of the 19th Century, and the recovering of the Vatican as a sovereign state well within the 20th Century. In 2015, Kertzer deals with this recovery in a book which won the *National Book Award*. The title of the book is, *The Pope and Mussolini. The Secret History of Pius XI and the Rise of Fascism in Europe*. In this latter book, this Jewish author reveals the powerful role performed by the papacy in the appearance of the fascist states of Europe.

Kertzer-s father was a Jewish rabbi, a chaplain in the American army when the USA invaded Italy, toward the end of World War II. Since the Jews were greatly mistreated by the papacy over centuries of religious obscurantism, (supposedly as revenge for what they did to Christ), Kertzer noticed a huge contrast produced with the French Revolution which required a government by the people and for the people, claiming equality for all. The sympathies of the Jews for the liberal political agenda may be easily understood in this context, as well as their sympathy for the Protestant movements which granted them freedom. The Jewish attraction to both liberation movements (secular and Protestant), would cause them to again be abhorred in Catholic milieus which would strive to recover their old lost power.

We Seventh-day Adventists have a similar historical sensitivity because we consider ourselves heirs of the Protestant legacy, Christians who were so wildly persecuted during the centuries of papal predominance. But differing from modern Jews, we know by prophecy that in this global religious-secular struggle, the clerical forces will recover their authority so that the world will be pushed to its final catastrophe. Despite many liberal discourses in current religious circles, the background of that contest does not allow us to naïvely overlook the past history which many are trying to change. Much less can we neglect the reality of what we are observing today. For this reason, in our review of the most important historical facts found in Kertzer's new book, we will not be satisfied with the information found in that book. Rather, when necessary, we will bring into consideration other pertinent historical facts which are related to the prophecy. We expect this approach will help us to better understand the role that we have to fulfill in this final step of human history, in agreement with what is portrayed in the Holy Scripture.

After reading and commenting on the first book of Kertzer on the relation of the papacy with fascism, we could not remain indifferent to the publication of a second book, regarding the papal attempts to superimpose the abusive medieval monarchy onto the boom of modern democracies. I knew that I would find in Kertzer's book of impressive documentation which uncovers with exceptional skill the political commitment of the papacy. I found this book on the internet when I was preparing a document entitled Holy See or Nest of Corruption (see my webpage: [<http://www.adventistdistinctivemessages.com/English/Documents/Holyseenest.pdf>]). Many

people are trying to transform the world into a new Eden, but after the fall of our first fathers, humanity became bad stewards of God's creation. Only God, according to the Bible, will create new heavens and a new earth, after destroying all the kingdoms and empires of this world (Dan 2:44; 2 Pe 3:9-13; Rev 11:18).

After reading the more than 400 pages in three days, I was impressed because those who interpret current history in the book, are normally its protagonists. Kertzer consistently gives voice to the actors who (from different perspectives) contributed to the events that marked the death of the political predominance of religion over the European states and the world at large. He can do this because he has many collaborators, and an easy access to abundant historical archives that exist on the internet.

No one can deny, after reading this author's two most important books, that the popes continued being openly absolutists and antidemocrats until the appearance of the first openly liberal political pope, John XXIII. While the absolutism of Pius IX pushes him to call the first Vatican Council to proclaim papal infallibility in the year 1870; the second Vatican Council convoked by John XXIII in the year 1962, marked an apparent spirit of openness toward other churches and the modern world at large. But we can anticipate that both the former conservative trend and the current liberal trend, have not forsaken the desire for the primacy of a monarchical system inherited from the Middle Ages that is represented by the papacy.

The political earthquake that shook Europe in the 19th Century

Kertzer emphasizes the importance of Pious IX to modern history, because that pope "would be the last of the pope-kings, the dual role which had been central to church doctrine and a pillar of Europe's political order for a thousand years" (3). However, he recognizes that "the political earthquake that was about to shake Europe" (54), came from half a century before, from the French Revolution which took place toward the end of the 18th century. Without being aware of this, our author uses the term that John employed in Revelation to portray the same event that would take place at the end of medieval oppression.

"At that very hour there was *a severe earthquake* and a tenth of the city collapsed" (Rev 11:13). E. G. White also referred to the fact that "France was *shaken as if by an earthquake*" (GC 286). The tenth of the oppressing earthly apocalyptic city that fell had to do with one of the ten tribes or European nations that were allied with the Roman papacy for 1290 years since the first Frank king (Clovis) founded his capital in Paris under a system that linked the state to the Roman Catholic religion. That political earthquake would spread to all Europe and the entire world, shaking any religious predominance, be it Buddhist, Confucian, Muslim, or pagan.

Several times Kertzer brings out the role of the Franks in the exile of the popes. For its importance in determining a date for the coup de grace to the political power of the papacy, foretold by Bible prophecy, I will quote some of its textual statements.

"As Napoleon's forces swept through the Papal States and laid waste to papal government, two popes were, one after the other, removed by force from Rome and driven into exile by French troops, Pius VI, exiled from Rome in 1798, died the next year in Valence, France. The conclave to elect his successor, Pius VII, was held not in Rome,

where the end of papal rule had been proclaimed, but in Venice. Although Pius VII was briefly allowed back to Rome, in 1809 he, too, was seized by French troops and taken to France” (15-16).

“In 1798 Napoleon had seized Rome and driven Pope Pius VI into exile. A decade later his armies returned and forced his successor, Pius VII, to abandon the city. Now the French army had again taken Rome, and again the fate of a Pope Pius rested in their hands” (257).

What was that political earthquake? Klemens Metternich, the chancellor of the Austrian empire who supported pope Pius IX understood it well. “The world rises up against the very idea of such a government [as exercised by the pope in the Pontifical States: theocratic]. The Catholic world is based on the principle of *authority*, while *the world does not want such an authority*... The world wants civil equality and authority based on the will of the people” (34). Pope Pius IX’s “fourth secretary of state in less than two years” resigned because he didn’t want to be part of “the dismantling of church authority in Rome” (64).

How the word “authority” resounds in Kertzer’s book in reference to the radical change that was taking place in the world! The French ambassador expressed it in 1848, shortly before Pius IX escaped from Rome: “Today..., the pope’s ‘authority is absolutely gone, it no longer exists other than in name’” (109). Carlo Armellini, in his opening address to the Assembly which was formed in Rome after the escape of the pope, said this: “You sit here, o Citizens, amidst the ruins of two great eras. On one side lie the ruins of Italy of the Caesars, on the other the ruins of Italy of the Popes. It is your task to construct a building that can rise from that rubble” (153).

After this, in February 9, 1849, the deputies of the Assembly voted a historical decree of four parts:

1. The papacy no longer exercises temporal power over the Roman State either in fact or in law.
2. The Roman pontiff will have all the guarantees necessary to freely exercise his spiritual authority.
3. The form that the Government of the Roman State will have is pure democracy, and it will take the glorious name of the Roman Republic.
4. The Roman Republic will have with the rest of Italy those relations required by their common nationality.”

Thus, Kertzer concludes that “the pope’s temporal power was no more. Only an army could bring it back, if it could be brought back” (153).

“Authority.” This is just one of the key terms found in the book of Revelation to speak about papal despotism, that would last 1260 years exactly. “The dragon [double symbol representing the Roman Empire of the Caesars and its spiritual counterpart, the devil], gave the beast his power and his throne and *great authority*” (Rev 13:2). “It was given... to exercise its *authority* for forty-two months” (Rev 13:5), that is, 1260 days, symbol of years in the Apocalyptic prophecies. “It was given *authority* over every tribe, people, language and nation” [a Catholic authority, that is, “universal”] (Rev 13:7).

What emperor gave that universal authority to the Roman papacy? Justinian, the Eastern Roman emperor, who in the year 533 committed himself to increase “the honor and authority of your See.” 1260 years later, on November 6, 1793, the National Convention de-Christianized France. The Justinian decree was militarily executed in the year 538 when the Ostrogoths (who reigned in Rome) were expelled from the city, and the pope was free to exert his authority without being subject to a non-Catholic government. In 1798, the Napoleonic army took away the “ring of Peter” in Rome, and declared, literally, that “other temporal *authority* emanating from the old government of the pope is suppressed and he shall no more exercise any function” (see documentation in A. R. Treiyer, *The Seals and the Trumpets...*, 110).

But the papacy didn’t want to yield, nor did the other monarchical Catholic countries which fought for several decades to retain that authority which was now being taken away from them.

“The vast Austrian Empire seemed on the verge of collapse. The first three months of 1848 had shaken Europe’s rulers: to the north, revolt in Vienna had sent [pro-papal chancellor] Metternich into exile [from where he couldn’t return anymore]; to the east, the Hungarians were demanding their own representative government; and to the south, not only Venice and Lombardy but Tuscany, too, were in revolt. In France, the monarchy [that had been reestablished a few years after the French Revolution], had been overthrown and a republic proclaimed; in Berlin and in the Rhineland, revolution had broken out; in Frankfurt, hundreds of delegates had gathered in assembly to call for universal male suffrage and the unification of the many German states and principalities into a single German nation. Sicily was in open revolt, and King Ferdinand had been forced to grant a constitution for the Kingdom of Naples, as had King Charles Albert in the Kingdom of Sardinia” (66).

And Pope Pious IX himself was already planning his flight to another kingdom.

The Pontifical States and the Holy Roman Empire

Throughout nearly the entire Middle Ages and up until 1870, the popes had been owners of what is today central Italy, which they governed politically like kings. All principal public positions were administered by cardinals and bishops. Though such a privileged position was strongly shaken at the conclusion of the 18th Century, the papacy still claimed jurisdiction in the 19th Century of what was known as Papal or Pontifical States. But after the French Revolution, many of the principal cities were rising up in a similar revolution. Only through the intervention of the Austrian Catholic emperors could the popes recover those cities in the north of their dominion.

According to Wikipedia, “the seeds of the Papal States as a sovereign political entity were planted in the 6th century. Beginning in 535, the Byzantine Empire, under emperor Justinian I, launched a reconquest of Italy that took decades and devastated Italy’s political and economic structures” [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Papal_States]. As already seen, such conquests began in the year 538 when the bishop of Rome was liberated from the Arian rulers who reigned on what remained of the old Roman Empire. The Lombardian attempts to reign in the midst of the 8th Century upon what was considered “Peter’s patrimony,” led the popes to resort to the French kings who intervened and determined that the papal territory embraced a considerable number of

cities in the peninsula. In the following century the territories upon which the pope would rule were determined, and the Carolingian kings would intervene only when the pope required it.

This is important because some ask from time to time why in Rev 13, the papacy is represented by “a beast,” a symbol of empires, and in Rev 17 the Catholic Church is represented by a whore which rules upon an empire. The papacy in the Middle Ages not only dominated politically the Christian kings and the emperors whom it crowned (submitting them to a total dependence of their pontifical authority), but also ruled politically as king. Actually, “the Pontifical States”—according to Wikipedia—“were the territories on the Italic peninsula under the temporal authority of the pope, from the year 751 until 1870”

[https://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/Estados_Pontificios]. However, in Rev 17 the apostle John sees the corrupt Roman church in the wilderness, at the end of human history, when she will be sentenced by God to destruction. It is in that period of time when the church loses her political power and will recover it again at the end for her definitive condemnation.

It is worthy of notice that the Holy Roman Empire, which inherited in the West the Rome of the Caesars, embraces in general terms the same period of time as the government of the pope over the Papal States. That empire was established in Europe “during the Early Middle Ages and continued until its dissolution in 1806 during the Napoleonic Wars”

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holy_Roman_Empire]. Historians used to mark the beginning of the Holy Roman Empire with the crowning of Charlemagne by the pope in the year 800. Others place its beginning in the 13th Century when for the first time the term Holy Roman Empire was employed. Yet others see in the baptism of Clovis into the Roman Catholic Church at the beginning of the sixth century, the first signs of a kingdom which would begin a war against the enemies of the pope over what remained of the Western Roman Empire. The kingdom of Clovis would be characterized by his devotion to the papal kingdom under a politico-ecclesiastical government system (see A. R. Treiyer, *The Apocalyptic Times of the Papacy*, chaps 7 and 8).

The Holy Roman Empire was strictly Catholic, though in its last stages it could not avoid admitting the inclusion of the Lutheran and Calvinist religion (any other religion was illegal). The emperor made an oath to engage himself to defend the Roman Catholic Church and to be loyal to the pope and his successors. He was required to kneel before the pope and kiss his feet. As an example, let us quote the oath of one of the emperors. “In the name of Christ, I, Frederick, the Emperor, promise, pledge and guarantee in the sight of God and the blessed Apostle Peter that I will be the protector and defender of this holy Roman Church in all ways useful to her.” A sword was then given to the Emperor with the word, “Receive this sword by the hands of bishops, who, though unworthy, are consecrated to be in the place and authority of the holy Apostles, deliver it to you, with our blessing, to serve for the defense of the holy Church, divinely ordained” [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coronation_of_the_Holy_Roman_Emperor]. The pope then, put the crown on the head of the new emperor.

This is the reason why the book of Revelation depicts the Harlot Church as prostituting with the kings of the earth, and riding the Holy Roman Empire represented now under the symbol of a beast. Actually, the Holy Roman Empire was characterized by the government of the emperor in submission to the pope. So much so that the scarlet color in the book of Revelation refers to both the harlot church and the medieval monarchical state. The blasphemous papal titles pervade the

Holy Roman Empire for supporting the idolatries and blasphemous “abominations” of the harlot church (Rev 17:3-5). So also her “mystery” involves them both (v. 7). Let us not forget that the emperors assumed that the papal agenda was to evangelize Europe through the sword of the imperial armies.

When did the Holy Roman Empire reached its end? On August 6, 1806, when the last emperor, Francis II of Austria, dissolved it after suffering a defeat at the hands of Napoleon. The French Revolution, characterized by secularism, ended his kingdom. The papacy had already lost any relevance to that Holy Roman Empire when it was ousted in 1798.

In the 20th Century, some European presidents again tried to promote the idea of a Holy Roman Empire, but without success. More recently, pope Benedict XVI claimed in the encyclical *Caritas in Veritate* (2009), the need of establishing a “world *authority*” able to impose an economic order which would bring stability to the world. Some interpreted it as a call to nominate a new emperor, this time over the whole world, to rule again as the papacy had done through the Holy Roman Empire. But the world *authority* required by pope Benedict XVI will not be exerted this time by any other power but the republican and protestant government of the United States of America. This is the government identified in prophecy that will restore the Roman papacy to its former political pedestal (Rev 13:11ff).

It is advisable to know this story well in order to better understand what occurred at the time of the political death of the papacy, and its loss of the Papal States from 1870 until 1929. During this entire period the popes, beginning with Pius Nono, were cloistered in the Vatican and refused to leave in order to avoid recognizing the new Roman secular state. This changed when Pius XI signed the Lateran Concordat with dictator Benito Mussolini in 1929. In that year the pope obtained an acknowledgement of his sovereignty over the tiny State of the Vatican, and several other properties within the old city of Rome, among them the Lateran Palace of the Holy See located on *Caelio Monte*, which constitute the “See” of the Roman Vicariate.

After losing the Pontifical States in 1870, “Pius cast himself as a prisoner,” expecting that divine providence would allow him to recover those states. “The pontiff hoped that 1870 would prove to be a repeat of 1848 [when he fled from Rome and could return later], as 1848 had proven to be a repeat of 1798 and 1809,” when Pius VI and Pius VII were taken into exile as prisoners and, in spite of that, the other popes could later return to Rome (344). Starting in 1870, cards depicted the image of Pius Nono as a prisoner behind the bars of a jail. Pius IX excommunicated all those who formed part of the new secular republic, and in his encyclical *Quanta Cura*—which was accompanied by a “Syllabus of Errors”—he condemned “freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. Catholics were required to believe that the pope must rule over a state of his own. All Catholics, he declared, were bound to reject the view that ‘the Roman Pontiff can and should reconcile himself to progress, liberalism, and modern civilization’” (340).

Since 1848, when Pius Nono fled from Rome, no pope has set himself in the Quirinal Palace, the highest of the seven mountains of Rome, where the papacy had had its see for many centuries. Beginning in 1871, that palace would become the residence of the new kingdom of Italy and later on of the Italian government as it is today.

The political and ecclesiastical role of the popes in the Pontifical States

“These were times of transformation in Europe, the old order unhinged by industrialization, revolutionary advances in transportation, and increasing doubts about the divinely ordained social order” (3). Pope Gregory XVI, predecessor of Pius Nono, “had a well earned reputation as a foe of all that was new” (4), “a bitter opponent of all that was modern” (10). Opposed to allowing railroads in his kingdom, he had also forbidden his subjects from taking part in the scientific congresses that were multiplying throughout Europe at the time. Ruling as he saw fit over the corrupt and ill-governed Papal States, the pope did not seem unduly bothered by the hostility of his three million subjects” (4). “Not long after his death jokes at his expense began making the rounds in Rome. As he approached Saint Peter at heaven’s gate, according to one of them, Gregory was so tired that he could barely move. ‘How much further is there to go?,’ asked the exhausted pope. ‘Well,’ replied Saint Peter, ‘if you had only allowed the railroad, you would already be there!’” (10).

“Poverty engulfed the countryside, but the sumptuous 16th and 17th century palaces of aristocrats and cardinals provided work for many of the people of Rome... For centuries, the popes themselves had often been drawn from these same families. Despite the wealth of its aristocrats, the splendor of their frescoed palaces, and the magnificence of many of the city’s churches, the capital of Christendom was a rather shabby sight. Nearly half the land inside the city’s wall consisted of abandoned fields” (4-5). When it rained heavily, the streets became a quagmire, and the fetid and yellow waters of the river Tiber flooded part of Rome, which didn’t contribute to the health of the city. The Jews suffered more on those occasions, because they lived in the lower zones of the city.

Malaria wrought havoc in summer. When the clergy required the population to withdraw into their houses to avoid popular uprisings, the people crammed inside. A Russian writer and social reformer portrayed Rome as having there “something senile, obsolete, deserted and dilapidated in the city’s exterior; its melancholy streets, its gloomy palaces” (4-6).

Rome counted 170,000 inhabitants and almost 400 churches, most of them richly decorated. It claimed to have 3,500 priests and 1,500 monks mostly enclosed in convents. Members of mendicant orders could not be distinguished from the numerous smelly poor who begged for alms.

“By contrast, the upper clergy were the princes of the church. Living in splendor, they held all the highest government positions and controlled the best farm land, producing half of all the agricultural wealth of the Papal States, yet paying no taxes. The prelates administered the public treasury, which they regarded as the property not of the public but of the church. They were also in charge of all the schools, the courts, and the police.” “‘A cardinal,’ observed the French ambassador, ‘is a prince in Rome, and a lord in the provinces’” (6).

By the word of the pope or of his cardinals, anyone suspected of rebellion against the ecclesiastical authorities could be sentenced to death. This could be more clearly seen when after two decades the pope was able to recover control of the government from the popular forces,

thanks to foreign intervention. They brought two guillotines to cut, taste and savor the heads of those who rebelled against the ecclesiastical authority.

“The lower clergy—priests, monks, friars, and nuns—were another matter. For the most part, they were from humble families, were poorly educated, and—especially in rural areas—lived in poverty themselves. The parish priests in the capital were an exception, for they enjoyed some of the power that came from the marriage of religious and civil authority. When they encountered a parish priest in the streets of Rome, men doffed their hats, women and children kissed his hand. These priests felt free to enter any home in their parish at any hour to see if church precepts were being obeyed. They employed spies and ordered police to search homes, make arrests, and haul offenders to the city’s dungeons. When those jailed were brought to court, often after some months, they came before judges who themselves were priests. There the parish priest’s testimony was treated as gospel” (6-7).

Many denunciations in the courts had to do with “adulterous relations or practicing sodomy, or for swearing, or for failing to observe the ban on eating meat during Lent. All this, of course, did not endear the clergy to the people nor make them eager to support the continuation of what they called ‘priestly rule’” (7). For this reason, the confessional was the most hated thing by the people. “For the people of Rome, nothing symbolized the intrusion of the priestly gaze into their lives more than the confessionals, where they were pressured to reveal their illicit thoughts and deeds under threat of excommunication” (210). If they did not willingly confess, they could not participate in communion, and became the target of the church’s suspicions. When the French came to attack the city toward the end of the first half of the century, the people pulled out the confessionals of the churches to make barricades with their wood, to protect themselves from the invasion. They even planned to make a bonfire with that wood after sunset (210).

“Every home and every shop had an image of the Madonna... Each family had a particular saint... ‘The Romans,’ wrote a French observer of the time, ‘follow the practices of devotion from habit, from fear of hell, and from fear of their parish priest.’ They will cheat a foreigner without scruple, he added, or knife a neighbor in a moment of anger, ‘but to miss Sunday mass, to fail to do the least thing due on the saint’s day, or to eat meat on Friday, never’ (7-8).

Pius Nono enjoyed evening excursions through the city. A witness described the scene. “Briskly, smiling, [the pope] came down the stairway, and with youthful ease climbed into the carriage. In the way he walked there was somehow something of a warrior, although his face was angelic.” When the pope’s carriage neared the people, they sank to their knees. As he passed, Pius graced them with an affectionate look and raised his hand in blessing” (46).

There was always a community of Jews in Rome. It was a small population, but it was mistreated for centuries by popes who justified their actions by citing the cruelty shown by the Jews against the Son of God. In Pius Nono’s days there were about 4,000 Jews. They had been confined to a walled ghetto since the 16th Century. A guard controlled the gates of that ghetto to prevent the Jews from entering and leaving freely. That guard had to be paid by the Jews themselves, who were not permitted to have businesses outside the city or to educate their sons in public schools. Hitler was inspired by this Catholic practice of hating Jews and also confined them to ghettos in the 20th Century. Curiously, when the coffers had been emptied in Rome, Pius IX resorted to a

foreign bank administered by Jews to borrow money. Those Jews demanded freedom for their brothers in Rome. But the pope washed his hands, saying that they were enclosed in ghettos to protect them from outside vandalism, which as everyone knew, was perpetrated by the church.

“While popes had ruled the Papal States for *over a thousand years*, the extent of their territories had ebbed and flowed, as they engaged in both military campaigns and diplomatic maneuvering to enlarge their realm... In all, the Papal States encompassed only 14 percent of the land of what is today Italy, but it lay right in the center of the peninsula. Most of its three million largely illiterate inhabitants were peasants, eking out a living from the land... In the wake of the French Revolution and the subsequent spread of its doctrines by Napoleon and the French army, people began to question the notion that God had ordained the social hierarchy to be as it was” (8).

Systems of government in contention

Pius IX believed, like all popes in general, that his political and religious authority came from God Himself. They also believed that the authority of the Catholic monarchs came from God, whose authority depended on the pope. In 1846, in his first encyclical, *Qui Pluribus*, Pius IX referred to the divine right of the European kings. “We hope that Our political leaders will keep in mind in accordance with their piety and religion, that the kingly power has been conferred on them not only for ruling the world but especially for the protection of the Church” (298).

This was understood by the Catholic kings in the 19th century who also felt that they had to prevent the fall of the papacy to avoid suffering the same fate. The people’s duty, according to the pope, was to submit to that divine authority of popes and kings, something which was also supported by the monarchy and the aristocracy which supported that authority. For this reason, when a popular government was formed and the Constituent Assembly was set up in Rome, all the Catholic countries intervened to bring it down and reestablish the papal government.

Curiously, Pius IX justified such a conviction of politico-religious authority by appealing to Romans 13:1-2, where it says that “there is no authority except that which God has established... Consequently, whoever rebels against the authority is rebelling against what God has instituted.” He also quoted Saint Augustine who declared that the Catholic Church taught the slaves to be in submission to their masters (311-312).

But the statement of Paul in Rom 13 is inserted within the concept of the kingdom of Christ as not belonging to this world (Matt 4:8-10; John 18:36). Paul meant that Christianity must not be involved in politic struggles (2 Cor 10:3-5), but proposed an inner spiritual transformation which, in the end, would eliminate the authoritarian government of Rome and its system of slavery. It is the obligation of all to respect the authority that God permitted to rule in order to maintain civil order, only insofar as it does not change the divine law. Such counsel did not imply that Christians need to endorse a particular system of government. On the contrary, God never wanted a monarchy in Ancient Israel as a system of government. As Arbiter of all destinies He merely tolerated it. Neither did Jesus want His church to exert in the spiritual realm the same monarchic style of government which prevailed in his days (Matt 20:25-28; Mar 10:42-45; Luc 22:24-27).

Unfortunately for the pope, the tremendous political earthquake produced by the French Revolution in Europe had crossed his borders and also made itself felt in Rome. The people no longer wanted that theocratic system of government which kings and clerics saw as divinely appointed and which submitted the people to an ecclesiastical and monarchical slavery too heavy to endure. What was the new popular doctrine really all about?

1) *Sovereignty*. The new expanding current philosophy of the 19th Century affirmed that sovereignty must not be in the hands of a few people who boast power (popes, ecclesiastics, kings, aristocrats), but in the hands of the people. “A pope-king, wielding an army and a police force, increasingly came to be viewed as a vestige of the Middle Ages.” They continued to accept the pope in his spiritual role, but many now believed he should not perform royal duties. Neither did the priests have any business running the police and the courts (9).

2) *Equality*. The principle of sovereignty for the people also implied equality. No more lineages! No more privileges for the few at the expense of the majority! No more ecclesiastical exclusion! The Jews had to have the same right as any other citizen. For this reason, when the people were establishing a Constituent Assembly in the pope’s absence after he fled to Naples, many shouted in parodies: “Long live the Excommunicated! Bon voyage to the pope and the cardinals!” When the Assembly was finally instituted by popular suffrage (140-141), the prisons were opened, and those who had been condemned by the Inquisition were freed (157). Even the incarcerated prostitutes went free (149).

Carlo Armellini, one of the three chosen members of the executive triumvirate, required the ecclesiastical institutions to provide an inventory of their properties. The priests resisted because they thought their properties would be confiscated. As a result, no few priests and monks went to jail. The ecclesiastical control of the schools and universities reached an end, with the exception of the religious seminaries (156). “All special privileges for the clergy were eliminated, as well as all ecclesiastical tribunals having jurisdiction over laypeople. The church’s vast landholdings were declared state property, and censorship was abolished” (157). “The government declared the Vatican palaces and the Quirinal to be public property. Hospitals, public charities, and orphanages, all previously run by the church, were now in the hands of the republic, as were their endowments” (159).

3) *Democracy and freedom*. In a modern society, every citizen, regardless of his belief, has the right to determine by vote the type of rulers he desires. This principle comes from the French Revolution. But it went against what the papacy had inculcated, based in the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, who believed that the best system of government was monarchical. This is the reason why from the French Revolution until Pius XII in the 20th Century, all the popes were antidemocrats, monarchical, and promoted fascism when monarchies fell.

Pius VI condemned human rights at the end of the 18th century, and “even as late as 1953, then-reigning Pope Pius XII reminded Roman Catholics on various occasions that freedom of conscience is ‘a mistaken idea which has no right to exist,’” A. Flis, *The Catholic Church’s War with Democracy*, 41, n. 3.

[http://dspace.upce.cz/bitstream/handle/10195/35321/FlisA_The?sequence=1]

This is important because beyond the presumable openness of the current popes, the new Roman Catechism denies freedom of conscience when it says that “the right to religious liberty is neither a moral license to adhere to error, nor a supposed right to error” (point 2108). These statements are taken from both popes Leo XIII (*Libertas praestantissimum* 18) and Pius XII (AAS 1953, 799). These two popes never assimilated the modern concepts of democracy and freedom of conscience.

“The view that democracy and human rights are incompatible with the principles of the Gospels was proclaimed unremittingly by all popes until the middle of the 20th century. With his denunciation of the French Revolution, Pius VI thus inaugurated an unproductive 150 years battle of the Vatican against liberalism” (A. Flis, *The Catholic Church’s War with Democracy*, 40-41).

In March 1791, in the encyclical *Quod Aliquantum*, Pius VI addressed the French bishops condemning the idea that the people cannot be discriminated for their religion. In his allocution he said that “in the eyes of the Assembly, this monstrous law is based in the freedom and equality natural to the human being, yet can there be something more incomprehensible than setting such a license for freedom and equality? This freedom [...] which the National Assembly grants humans as an inalienable inborn right is incompatible with the law set by God the Creator... Human society is nothing more than only a general contract to listen to kings whose power stems not from a social contract but from God” (cf. A. Flis, 40). In his apostolic letter of March 1791, Pius VI condemned the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizens voted by the French National Assembly, and especially the principles of equality and freedom of speech that it contained, as tending to “the overthrow of the Catholic faith and with it the obedience owed the King” (*ibid*, 41).

Pope Gregory XVI, in his encyclical *Mirari Vos* of 1832, referred to liberalism as “an abominable doctrine,” and freedom of conscience as “a mistake, an absurdity, or even madness” (*ibid*, 41). Appended to the encyclical *Quanta Cura* of Pius IX promulgated in 1864, was a document entitled *Syllabus Errorum* in which the 80th (and final) error was the “propagated word and act” that the pope “can and should be reconciled with progress, liberalism, and modern culture.”

4) *Nationalism and unification*. Europe was not divided as we see it today. There were several principalities in Germany. “The Italian Peninsula at the time was divided into a multitude of different states, a patchwork of kingdoms, imperial outposts, and duchies. Many were ruled directly or indirectly by the Austrian Empire” (9). But now, nationalism boomed everywhere, and did not spare the Italian Peninsula, requiring unification. The people preferred something new rather than choose to revive the medieval past. They didn’t want any more foreign armies invading Italy to keep the abusive system that had prevailed in Europe for more than a millennium.

The priests most hated by the liberals who proposed the unification of the different Italian states were the Jesuits. In 1843 Vincenzo Gioberti believed that the Jesuits were the greatest enemies of Italy. In 1846 he published a book on *The Modern Jesuits*, where he portrayed them as the source

of every evil, in part for the profane alliance with Catholic Austria which invaded the north to support the papal system. “If I had to choose,” he wrote in a letter in 1847, “between chasing out the Austrians and banishing the Jesuits, I would rather do the latter, because without the Jesuits the Austrians can do little harm and would not last long” (48-49).

No wonder that in this context, Pius Nono condemned the “unification” of Italy. He saw that this unification carried the elimination of the monarchical systems. He told Alfonso Rayneval, the French diplomatic in Naples, that “the Italian liberals... have only one idea in their heads: unification. An impractical idea... that will lead only to heartbreak here... Just because France succeeded in establishing its unity, should it be assumed that Italy can do the same? ... You French..., you have a prodigious instinct for nationality. You are always ready to sacrifice yourselves for your country. Have you seen anything similar in Italy? Unification is a wild dream..., and the sovereigns among whom Italy is divided are [for those liberals] obstacles that they must remove... But among these obstacles the greatest of all is the Pope. Putting an end to the Pope’s sovereignty is, for them, to accomplish three-quarters of their goal” (298). And when his prophecy was fulfilled, he issued an encyclical in 1871 where he excommunicated again the leaders of the new Italian nation, declaring it null, and derogating the governmental occupation of the Papal States (343).

5) *Separation of Church/State*. Pius IX realized that the national spirit was growing in Italy, and supported it at the beginning expecting to ingratiate himself with the people. Thus, many thought that the pope would support them in their struggle for independence from foreign powers. But soon the pope noticed the reason why he was cheered. When Giuseppe Montanelli, (a champion of the federation of the Italian States), told him that the people applauded him because they thought that he would bring independence, unity, and freedom to Italy, Pius IX replied: “This is true,” but “nothing pleases me more than when I hear people in Rome shouting not ‘*Viva Pio Nono*’ but ‘*Viva il Santo Padre*’ [Long live the Holy Father]. Because while the one is a political cry, the other is a religious one. They say ‘*Viva Pio Nono*’ to me. ‘*Viva il Santo Padre*’ they say to Saint Peter’s successor” (47).

In reality, Pius IX wanted to be acclaimed in both ways. He was one of the popes who enjoyed the favor of the people in the early years of his reign. But he got upset when after every concession, the people required more. The people came to believe that the pope himself could be the leader in Italy of the liberal change that was taking place in Europe. And in spite of the pleasure the pope took in his demagogic popularity, the moment came when Pius Nono realized that the popular demands were incompatible with his supposed divine pontifical commitment. And when he showed his claws concerning his true ideology, he accused the people of being ungrateful for the abundant affection he had shown them.

Today many believe that the papacy has changed along these lines, because since John Paul II, the latest popes have been advocating for the separation of Church and State. But this is another deception. As I prove in another document titled “Holy See or Nest of Corruption?,” the “separation” they require is not the State over the Church, but the Church over the State. While modern principles of democracy and freedom require mutual separation, (without interference of the state in the religious realm, nor interference of religion in the state), the Roman Catholic

Church continues advocating that the duty of the state is to impose the dogmas of the church. See [<http://www.adventistdistinctivemessages.com/English/Documents/Holyseenest.pdf>].

The escape

Several clubs were organized in Rome to foment the new ideas regarding independence which came from France. The most significant were the Popular Club and the Roman Club (103). Fearing the increasing popular support for sentiments requiring equality in Rome, the pope didn't dare to promenade in the city. The people began to ask why he had confined himself in his palace. The cardinals felt the pope should show himself before the people, and told him one day that everything was calm and he could venture out again to bless the people. When about 300 persons saw him, they surrounded his carriage and began to shout: "Death to the Jesuits!" They raised a poster which said: "Holy Father, Justice for the People," which implied a condemnation of the ecclesiastical courts and the papal police. The pope wanted the approval of the people, but to continue to provide for them at his will and pleasure. As someone detected at that time, he liked "liberal measures and arbitrary rule," something impossible to combine (56-57).

When the people realized that they had imagined a pope who never was, because he would not concede all the changes they required, many stop cheering him "Viva Pio Nono," to shout "traitor" and "imbecile" (86). Sometime later the cardinal secretary of state wrote to all the nuncios of Europe, that "a conspiracy has been hatched, a plot which purposed to strip away the sovereignty of the people. Rumors ran that if the pope would not back a war against Austria for invading the north of the Papal States, the civic guards would take him away from his Quirinal Palace, and confine him in the Basilica of Saint John Lateran. From there he could exercise his spiritual role, and leave the political duty to others (91-91). The Sardinian ambassador noticed that "everywhere" the pope was "being treated with contempt" (92).

In his desperation, the pope nominated as Interior Minister (in charge of the police), as well as Minister of Finance, a strong man like Pellegrino Rossi. Through him he expected to impose order on a government that had gotten out of hand. Rossi was looked upon as a traitor to the populist cause which he had formerly supported. But Rossi replied: "if they want to destroy the pope's authority, they'll have to do it over my dead body" (101). And this was exactly what happened at the conclusion of the year 1848. At the ugly shouts of the multitudes, "slit his throat! Slit his throat! Kill him!", a young man rushed up on his right and beheaded him. Hundreds stood up before the window of his house and shouted to his widow and his two sons: "Blessed is the hand who stabbed Rossi!" "Blessed be the hand that stabbed the tyrant!" (103).

No defender of the pope appeared there at that demonstration. The Popular Club announced that they would keep order until the nomination of a new government. The pope was not intimidated and required everyone to go home. The multitude became angry and burned part of the palace gates. The flames within could barely be contained and threatened to burn the whole building. The man who was obliged to read aloud the official text of the pope was struck in the chest by a bullet when he stood before a window near the pope. At that moment there were already 10,000 people who had met there, many of them armed. The Civic Guard disarmed the Swiss Guard of the pope, and took control of the Quirinal Palace (106-108). The majority of the cardinals deserted. Nowhere could the aristocrats be seen. Pius Nono had to yield before the demands of a

constitution and a new popular government, while declaring in private to the foreign powers that that government was illegitimate.

Pius IX knew that the moment had come to escape. Disguised as a common priest with black gaffes, he managed to evade the Civic Guard through a secret passage, and left toward the south. Several Catholic countries offered him refuge. Among them were Spain, France (which was still struggling between Catholicism and Atheism), Austria and Bavaria. But where could the pope perform his function with the greatest freedom, and obtain foreign support to return to Rome? He did not trust the French because the two former popes had been confined there. Finally he opted to confine himself in Gaeta, near Naples, where a faithful Catholic, Ferdinand II, ruled the Two Sicilies (Sicily and Naples).

The power vacuum left in Rome after the flight of the pope was filled by the liberal forces, which by masculine universal suffrage established a Constituent Assembly, which in turn appointed a Triumvirate, which put an end to the ecclesiastical and aristocratic impunities. From Gaeta, the pope excommunicated them on January 1, 1849, and began to call for a military intervention by Catholic countries, to impose order in Rome and reestablish him in his papal see. The pope told them that only a few individuals had caused his problems in Rome (160).

Austria was willing to come in the pope's aid, but could not do it without the authorization of France, a country which had already warned the kingdom of Austria not to intervene unilaterally in Rome (160,169). Spain would send troops to invade the peninsula in the south, supporting king Ferdinand II. Pope Pius IX and the Austrian emperor agreed to invade the north of the Papal States, leaving France to intervene directly in Rome. They expected that after reestablishing order in the city, they could succeed in convincing the French to leave. But France had said that they would respect the peoples' decision.

A third of the population voted to appoint a Constituent Assembly, in spite of the papal threat to excommunicate them as insurgents for establishing that government, a threat that materialized on January 1, 1849. The assembly declared the government of the pope to be null and appointed in its place a triumvirate. As we have already seen, all ecclesiastical and aristocratic impunities were abolished and all freedoms granted by human rights were promulgated. General Garibaldi, the hero of two worlds (South America and Europe), came with his legionaries and offered his service to the new government. Facing the threat of invasion, the triumvirate prepared for the defense of the city, even as the pope accused them of anarchy, saying that their alleged cause was a lie, and that there was peace and order in Rome.

French duplicity

In 2018 France won the Soccer World Cup in Russia. An American senator said it was actually won by Africa because the principal players were French nationalized Africans. The French ambassador reacted by saying that in France there is no racism as there is in America, so for French people, France was the champion. Was that really so?

I could not avoid remembering the conversation that I had some years ago with a Cameroonian on the train from Kiev to the Crimea. He was the only one with whom I could speak because

(like myself) people in Cameroun speak French. I asked him why he was in Ukraine, and not in France where he was not forced to learn a new language? He replied that he had received a scholarship. But he went beyond my question and told me that Ukrainians are racists. Again I asked him why then he was not going to France? He replied that while in Ukraine there is open racism, in France racism is steeped in hypocrisy, and that he preferred a frank racism to one that is disguised.

When reading the book of David Kertzer on the role of France at that time of secular revolution in Rome, I can see the same ambivalent politics that he interprets as “duplicity.” France sent an army with the intention of putting order in Rome, while saying that they would respect the sovereignty of the people. The Romans replied that the current government had been elected by the people, so why should they now come with an army to take the city? In the meantime, France promised the pope to reinstall him in Rome, but required him to respect the decision of the people. So both the pope and the Roman Republic mistrusted the true purposes of the French, only from different perspectives.

That duplicity or hypocrisy had a tangible background. France was still struggling between liberals and conservatives, so its ambassadors before the pope in Gaeta and Rome were Catholics, and they didn’t give an accurate report of the situation. On the other hand, France did not want to leave the way free for Austria to play its political role without restrictions (165,174). And Austria didn’t want give France an excuse to support the turbulent peoples in the north of the Peninsula where Austrians dominated. For this reason, Austria proposed that the French stay in Rome, and leave the north to Austria (160).

“After the Rome of the Emperors, after the Rome of the Popes, will come the Rome of the People,” said Mazzini, the hero of the Roman Republic (162). But the French were coming with an army to overturn the Triumvirate now ruling in Rome though it was backed by a masculine universal suffrage. Pretending to establish a government of the people, they intended to reestablish the government of the pope. At the same time, the French ambassador told Pius IX: “People view Austria as representing the principle of absolutism and the Austrians as the oppressors of Italy. We, on the contrary, are seen as the defenders of freedom, as the protectors of the emancipation of peoples” (171). But then, why were the French intending to reestablish the pope in Rome?

Believing that keeping the temporal government of the venerable Head of the Church was intimately linked to the splendor of Catholicism, Louis Bonaparte won the elections in France. He purposed, therefore, to reestablish Pius Nono in Rome, under condition of accepting a secular government. But while the pope did not give a whit, the Catholic ambassadors of France in Gaeta and Rome shared the hope of the French government that the pope would change, something that never happened.

The French believed the pope. After disembarking in Italy, they sent part of their army to Rome, thinking that they would have the support of the people, who they had been led to believe were being controlled by just a few extremists. But they met unexpected resistance and were repelled with significant losses. This convinced the French that the people of Rome no longer wanted a papal government, but on the other hand, they did not want to lose face by withdrawing due to

defeat. They felt the need to recover the honor of France by taking the city and winning the war. This is why they later returned with the entire army which was far superior in weapons and soldiers to the improvised army of Rome.

The people of Rome prepared a defense as best they could, willing to defend themselves to die if necessary. The American diplomat wrote then: “the contest is no longer between one army and another... but it is a struggle that embraces a whole world of ideas, hopes and faith, that may have an echo in the most distant generations. The actual object of the intervention is shaking the edifice of the Catholic religion to its very foundations, crushing that faith in thousands of hearts... The consequence, naturally, is that many are now asking themselves whether he who represents a religion of peace has a right to reassert temporal power by force of arms; and ... not a few begin to doubt the truth of the Catholic religion, in consequence of the acts of its head. They cannot conceive how a religion ... is now changed into a weapon intended to transform free men into slaves” (236-7).

Many French realized that the French government had fallen into a trap set by its own duplicity. Not a few declared that they were playing a ridiculous role, by supporting the pope who fully intended to rule Rome as in the Middle Ages, while pretending to defend the sovereignty of the people (243). But they had lost the first battle and must recover their prestige and honor. For this reason, they ceased to insist that the pope to yield to the liberal demands of the people, and were satisfied with asking him to be lenient in his policy toward them once reinstated.

The decisive battle lasted nearly a month. The Triumvirate saw that the massacre would become frightening if they didn't surrender. They consulted Garibaldi, who told them that the best thing was to abdicate and return later. “Italy needs martyrs, many martyrs, before it can be free and great,” they said, as they departed (245). Before leaving, the Triumvirate wrote to the Romans: “A cloud rises over you today. It will not last long ... God wants Rome to be free and to be great; and it will be. Yours is not defeat. It is the victory of the martyrs for whom burial is the stairway to heaven” (249).

Moments before the French entered the city, the president of the Assembly gathered the people and read a constitution that they had been preparing. “The democratic government,” he read, “has as its basic rule equality, freedom, and fraternity. It does not recognize titles of nobility, nor privileges of birth or of caste.” That constitution recognized the equality of all before the law, regardless of religion. “Capital punishment was abolished, freedom of speech and association assured, and privacy protected. An Assembly elected by universal male suffrage would make the laws” (252).

A French military marching band entered the city, but was compelled to desist when they saw that they were unpopular, and the people hated them, shouting: “Long live the Roman Republic!” “Death to Pius IX!” “Soldiers of the pope!” They shouted at the French general: “Cardinal Oudinot!” “Liar!” “Butcher of Rome!” “A handful of papal loyalists who imprudently greeted the French troops with shouts of welcome ended up dead, victims of the people's wrath” (253).

The French forced the return of the pope to Rome, who thanked the French general for reestablishing order in the face of anarchy that was caused, in his words, by few men. However,

he regretted the French indulgence which allowed the escape of the revolutionaries whom he wanted to see judged and annihilated, and for not raising the papal flag in Rome (260). However, Louis Napoleon said in France: "When our armies made their way through Europe, they left everywhere, in their wake, the destruction of the abuses of feudalism and the seeds of freedom. It will not be said that, in 1849, a French army could act in a different direction and lead to different results" (288).

But this is just what ended up being said of the French. The ecclesiastical courts were reestablished in Rome, two guillotines were brought, and an impressive number of victims were beheaded for two decades from those who had supported the Republic (337). This happened in the presence of the French troops who didn't intervene to stop the massacre. But this policy only increased the hatred of the population toward the government of the pope, which could not be appeased. Some battles may be won through armies, but in this case the pressure which grew from the grass roots would end by exploding with consequences so vast that their influence is felt even today, more than one and a half centuries half later.

Change of tide and proclamation of papal infallibility

After the recovery of papal power in Rome under the protection of the French troops, for about 20 years there were serious virulent reactions in France for the role that country had performed there. Even the great novelist Victor Hugo unmasked before the French Assembly the duplicity of the French government. "You have, on one side, the president of the Republic, calling for freedom for the Roman people ... On the other side, you have Cardinal Antonelli, refusing, in the name of the clerical government. Choose!" (302).

Alexis de Born Tocqueville, minister of Louis Napoleon in 1849, could see uneasily, how the clerical forces imposed themselves in Rome, destroying the constitutional government and restoring papal theocracy. For this reason he could not later defend the truth before the French Assembly, because he had belonged to the party that supported the pope. "How could he tell the deputies that the pope was committed to a return to the old theocracy and that the French government had, against the express wishes of the Assembly, used the nation's military might to destroy a republic, end constitutional rule, and restore a government widely viewed as a vestige of medieval times? How could he admit that far from acting to thwart the ambitions of Austria, France's bitter rival, the government had done exactly what the Austrians wanted it to do?" (393).

In 1850 Luigi Carlo Farini, physician and historian of the Italian unification, as well as first minister of the Kingdom of Italy, wrote by telegraph: "Both education and charity governed and administered by the clergy. Clerical police and French police in Rome, clerical police and Austrian police in the provinces. Censorship of the press administered ... not by any law, but by the whim of the Holy Office of the Inquisition, the bishops, the police ... All the old civil, communal, ecclesiastical, mixed, and exceptional tribunals restored ... All the old immunities and privileges of the clergy restored ... The Jesuits resurgent and more powerful ... The prisons full" (315).

Many witnesses in Rome who never withheld their allegiance from the pope reported the popular hatred toward him. But the political winds would finally change, marked no doubt by providence. In 1859, Louis Napoleon proclaimed himself Napoleon III. Victor Emanuel II, the son of Carlos Alberto who had been dethroned by the Austrians in Sardinia, was anxious to avenge the ignominious defeat of his father one decade earlier. The French and Sardinian forces combined now in a new attempt to expel the Austrians from the North of the Italian peninsula. Once the Austrians were ousted, the people went to the streets to roll up the papal flag and expel the clergymen who ruled in the name of the pope. In 1860 the pope refused to negotiate with Victor Emanuel II, and demanded in an encyclical “the pure and simple restitution” of the Papal States, excommunicating again those who usurped the papal lands (339).

Becoming aware of these liberal movements, general Garibaldi disembarked in Sicily with an army of one thousand volunteers, and began to advance toward the north, toward the kingdom of Naples. Francis II, the young king and son of Ferdinand II, surrendered in 1861. Now all the southern region was in the hands of king Victor Emanuel II. Later on the Kingdom of Italy was established by proclamation, not including Venetia (still in Austrian hands), and Rome in deference to the people and the French troops which were still there, which in turn asked the Italian king not to touch Rome (339). But for the patriots, no unification of Italy could be complete without the inclusion of Rome, the capital.

Antonelli, the intransigent cardinal of the pope, according to Britain’s envoy in Rome, “hopes in a European war to set matters right again in the Holy See!” It was then, in 1864, when the pope proclaimed his encyclical *Quanta Cura* already mentioned above, accompanied by a *Syllabus of Errors*, where he warned against freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. In 1868 the pope was still confident because volunteer Catholics from many countries had come to fight for him (from France, Ireland, Germany, and even from Canada). In 1869 the American poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow found the city of Rome “beleaguered” and “depressing.” He told Cardinal Antonelli how little the city had changed in 40 years when he had visited the first time. “Yes, thank God!,” replied the cardinal, pausing to put a pinch of snuff to his nose (340-1).

Pius Nono never went to the Quirinal Palace because it brought him bad memories associated with the Republic. Actually, he surprised the world by calling all the bishops, cardinals and heads of religious orders to a council in the Vatican Palace. No such council had been called in 350 years. It is known as Vatican Council I. That council had four sessions. At the last one, in July 1870, the dogma of *papal infallibility* was voted in the face of strong opposition, but as being the necessary solution for the church’s survival (341). All realized that when the French troops left, the papal government would fall and with it, a revengeful tide would cause havoc, just as it had at the conquest of the king in the South and in northern Italy. If the pope had to flee again, and if he could not return to Rome, he could at least rule the Catholic Church from any other place in the world, and his word would have to be obeyed as infallible. “Religion,” Pius explained in a public address he gave in the midst of the council, “is immutable; not an idea, but the truth. Truth knows no change” (341).

Josef George Strossmayer, coming from Croatia, gave his famous discourse at that council. Kertzer doesn’t make reference to that speech, perhaps because as a Jew he was not interested in

his biblical and historical argumentation against both papal supremacy and infallibility. His message lasted three hours, in the midst of furious shouting of the other cardinals and bishops who accused him of being a heretic. A transcript of that speech can be found on the following webpage, [http://www.mtc.org/bishop_s.html]

I frankly don't understand how Strossmayer could give such a discourse. It is worthy of reading all the documentation he employed. I believe that God used him in a way similar to Stephen when he addressed his last speech to the Jewish leaders in the last warning message given to that nation. In essence, according to what he declared, there is no biblical or historical foundation to have a pope, much less consider him infallible. He said that the raising of the papacy marked the moral and spiritual fall of the Christian church, with a corruption that still exists today. He warned that God doesn't need General Garibaldi to punish such a blasphemy, implying that the secular sword was at the door.

The proclamation of papal infallibility on July 18, 1870 infuriated practically all the governments of Europe, because this implied the endorsement and intent to maintain all the accumulation of barbarism committed during the Middle Ages against human rights. Even more, the existing kings felt that they would lose influence over their Catholic subjects who would follow the pope over them. But the cardinals and bishops voted it because they believed that this was the only way to keep the Catholic faith in the battle for the survival of the church. Those church leaders who favored infallibility felt the wrath of the people, who insulted the papacy with terms like "madmen," incorrigible, schismatic snake" (341-342).

In consequence, Napoleon III threatened to withdraw the French troops from Rome. Two days before the proclamation of the papal dogma of infallibility, France had declared war on Prussia. It was not hard then, for king Napoleon III, to withdraw his troops from Rome one week later, after the proclamation of papal infallibility, on July 27 to be more precise. Every military effort must now be focused on Prussia.

The moment had come for the king of the new Italian Republic to invade Rome. Over the centuries, since Justinian had installed the pope as sovereign of Rome, no king had been established in that city officially and permanently. On September 20, 1870, the assault of the Roman walls began. Instead of several weeks, as it took to the French invaders two decades before because of the heroic resistance of the people, it now took the Italian army but a few hours. According to the American consulate in Rome, Papal forces could not offer a strong and consistent resistance because the multitudes welcomed the liberators. Those who had ruled Rome up to that time were forced to yield before the warm welcome given by the people to the liberators. Those rulers were sent to the jails and prisons of the city.

The following year, Victor Emanuel made his triumphal entry to the new capital of Italy, and installed himself in the Quirinal Palace. "Today," the eminent historian Ferdinand Gregorovius wrote in his diary, "is the close of the thousand years' dominion of the Papacy in Rome." In a new encyclical issued the following month, Pius IX reiterated his excommunication of the leaders of the new nation, and declared the Italian occupation of the Papal States null and void" (343). The pope now cast himself as a prisoner in the Vatican, as did the following popes until Pius XI signed a contract with fascist dictator Benito Mussolini in 1929, agreeing to limit his

jurisdiction to the small tract of land we know as “The Vatican”. He recognized, however, for the first time, the legitimacy of the Italian Republic.

In 1881, Leo XIII wanted to honor the request of Pius Nono to be buried in the Basilica of San Lorenzo. In order to avoid complications, the current pope organized the secret transfer of Pius IX’s resting place at midnight, along a secret road. But among the thousands of faithful who came to honor the martyred pope, large numbers of anticlerical people were mixed. When the procession reached the bridge over the river Tiber, hundreds of persons began to shout: “Into the river!,” in an attempt to plunge the dead pope’s remains into the Tiber’s yellow waters. It was hard for the Swiss Guards to thwart their plan. Some years ago, a posthumous acknowledgment was given to Pius Nono by John Paul II, who beatified him, and there are rumors today of attempts to canonize him in Rome.

Conclusion

David Kertzer does not conceal his sympathies for the political liberalism which brought freedom to the world, a freedom from medieval absolutism and despotism. We can understand him and agree with him. As a Jew, his skin is more sensitive to the oppression experienced by his people for so many centuries under an abusive monarchical system that pretends to have been imposed by God yet enslaves masses of people. Kertzer is to be eulogized for his emphasis on this history of Rome, on the importance of maintaining the separation of Church and State in order to obtain and preserve freedom. But, could we consider illuminism and secularism as a viable solution to the problems of humanity?

Modernism is no a solution either. The other extreme on which Kertzer doesn’t speak is the political left seen in the totalitarian atheistic communism which excludes minorities and oppresses in a similar manner freedom of speech and religion. Monarchical and medieval religious absolutism as well as political liberalism are two extremes of the same horseshoe (closer to each other than to the center) which cannot bring peace to humanity. The freedom we currently enjoy is the outcome of the confrontation between these two conflicting powers. But when one of them succeeds in imposing its will over the other, oppression appears at once.

Which of these two systems liberate people from the moral corruption which suffocates the world? Neither. “There is no peace for the wicked” (Isa 48:22; 57:21). Medieval clerical moral corruption has been exposed in modern times in such a way that no one may pretend that those medieval times were holy. On the other hand, the excess of modern liberalism are also seen clearly today. Moral and spiritual corruption pervades all social and religious levels. I show this in an extensive document entitled, “Holy See or Nest of Corruption?”

[<http://www.adventistdistinctivemessages.com/English/Documents/Holyseenest.pdf>].

Leftist liberal politics are becoming more and more discredited today. Papal and religious political authority gains strength, though the political battle continues to be fought from an ideological perspective. Leftist regimes are more freely being considered just another form of slavery in the world. But does that give license to politicians on the right to impose by law religious dogmas once again on society? We know from the prophecies of the Bible that religious intolerance will once more become rampant throughout humanity, when a blasphemous

antichrist will impose his will on the whole world. This will cause the last tribulation upon the last “remnant” people who keep the commandments of God and have the faith of Jesus (Rev 13:11-18; 14:12; cf. 12:17). But the result will be his final destruction (Rev 14:9-11; 18).

It is good to cooperate with people of good will who long to better this world, and as individual citizens, to support regimes which will grant us freedom of conscience. Because even knowing that God will give us another body of eternal glory (Philip 3:21) does not cause us to willingly damage the only one we have today, to accelerate its destruction (see 1 Cor 6:19; 2 Cor 6:17). So also we try to do our best to improve this world, while waiting for the final redemption that God promises us (Rom 8:22-23). God will judge our life and decide if he will grant us an eternal abode in the beyond by the way we treat our body and our fellow men (1 Cor 3:6-17; Rev 11:18). But let us not dream with a human solution to solve all the problems of our life and the world. Salvation and total regeneration comes only from God.

It is regrettable that Kertzer ends his book without mentioning the definitive solution that only the Bible can offer. True liberation offered by God is inner liberation for any soul overwhelmed because of sin. That liberation brings peace through divine forgiveness (Rom 5:1). This is a liberation from moral corruption that transforms every converted person in such a way that his life agrees with the law of God (Ps 119:45; James 2:12). Jesus came just for this, and the world despised him because the world wanted a purely political exterior liberation. Said the Lord: “if the Son sets you free, you will be free indeed” (John 8:36). “You will know the truth [of the Word of God], and the truth will set you free” (v. 32). “Now, the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom” (2 Cor 3:17).

Where was God—many Jews ask—when the “holocaust” took place? Where was God, ask many others, when the Roman papacy tortured and burned millions of human beings at the stake during the millennium of the Middle Ages? Where is God today when hatred and human passions arise everywhere, bringing sickness, misery, death, and destruction? The answer is in the cross of Calvary. What was God doing there?

On the cross of Calvary “God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ, not counting people’s sins against them. And he has committed to us the message of reconciliation” (2 Cor 5:19). There God Himself was representing vividly the command of the Lord who said, “love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, that you may be children of your Father in heaven” (Matt 5:44-45). Millions of Christians have appeared throughout the centuries ready to give their life for the One who gave His life to liberate them. This is true liberation. It is liberation from hatred, from bitterness, from the inner prison of wickedness. It is also faith in the promise of final divine restoration.

“Come to me, all of you who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest,” said Jesus (Matt 11:18). The promise given by God to all troubled people of this world is fulfilled in the Son of God. That spiritual promise was fulfilled with the first coming of Christ. “The Spirit of the Sovereign LORD is on me, because the LORD has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor. He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim freedom for the captives and release from darkness for the prisoners” (Isa 61:1). This is the true “spring” of freedom that people look for vainly today from a political perspective.

Since men in their fallen condition will never be able to solve the problems of this world, our faith is focused also on the final liberation that God promises to those who accept the initial spiritual liberation, through the gospel. That liberation will take place when the Lord Himself will come from heaven to judge and destroy all the kingdoms of the world, and create new heavens and a new earth where justice will reign forever in the midst of His redeemed subjects.

“In the days of those kings, the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that will never be destroyed, nor will it be left to another people. It will shatter all these kingdoms and bring them to an end, but will itself stand forever” (Dan 2:43). “I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded because of their testimony about Jesus and because of the word of God... They came to life and reigned with Christ a thousand years” (Rev 20:4). “Then the sovereignty, power and greatness of all the kingdoms under heaven will be handed over to the holy people of the Most High. His kingdom will be an everlasting kingdom, and all rulers will worship [God] and obey him” (Dan 7:27). “But the holy people of the Most High will receive the kingdom and will possess it forever—yes, for ever and ever” (Dan 7:18). “Until the Ancient of Days came and pronounced judgment in favor of the holy people of the Most High, and the time came when they possessed the kingdom” (Dan 7:22). “They will reign for ever and ever” (Rev 22:5).

“The Lord is not slow in keeping his promise, as some understand slowness. Instead he is patient with you, not wanting anyone to perish, but everyone to come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come like a thief. The heavens will disappear with a roar; the elements will be destroyed by fire, and the earth and everything done in it will be laid bare. Since everything will be destroyed in this way, what kind of people ought you to be? You ought to live holy and godly lives as you look forward to the day of God and speed its coming. That day will bring about the destruction of the heavens by fire, and the elements will melt in the heat. But in keeping with his promise we are looking forward to a new heaven and a new earth, where righteousness dwells” (2 Pet 3:9-13). Cf. Isa 66:22). The Lord will come “to destroy those who destroy the earth” (Rev 11:18).

John projects this future world that only God can create, not man. “I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and there was no longer any sea. I saw the Holy City, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride beautifully dressed for her husband. And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, “Look! God’s dwelling place is now among the people, and he will dwell with them. They will be his people, and God himself will be with them and be their God. ‘He will wipe every tear from their eyes. There will be no more death or mourning or crying or pain, for the old order of things has passed away.”

“He who was seated on the throne said, ‘I am making everything new!’ Then he said, ‘Write this down, for these words are trustworthy and true.’ He said to me: ‘It is done. I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End. To the thirsty I will give water without cost from the spring of the water of life. Those who are victorious will inherit all this, and I will be their God and they will be my children. But the cowardly, the unbelieving, the vile, the murderers, the sexually immoral, those who practice magic arts, the idolaters and all liars—they will be

consigned to the fiery lake of burning sulfur. This is the second death” (Rev 21:1-8; see chapter 22).