

Kirsi Salonen

## Eugenio Pacelli and the Role of the Apostolic Nuncio in Germany in 1917–1929 According to the Nunciature Archives

### Introduction

This chapter examines the activity of the apostolic nuncio, Eugenio Pacelli, the later Pope Pius XII<sup>1</sup>, in Germany in the years 1917–1929 through a thorough analysis of the entire documentation in the archives of the apostolic nunciatures in Munich and Berlin. The archives, which are nowadays kept in the Vatican Secret Archives, consist of well over 200 large boxes of material.<sup>2</sup> The chapter concerns Pacelli's role as apostolic nuncio in light of the nunciature material and compares the results to what has earlier been said about his activities and interests in inter-war Germany.

The first part of the chapter concentrates on the overall content of the nunciature archives and argues that political issues played a much more central role in the mission of Pacelli than earlier has been expected. The second part of the chapter discusses what kind of role Pacelli took in various political issues involving religious-nationalistic problems in which he was

- 
- 1 Since this chapter deals with Pacelli as nuncio in Bavaria and Germany, no attention will be paid to his later career as cardinal secretary of state (1930–1939) or as Pope Pius XII (1939–1958) – not even to his later relationship with the Nazi-Germany, even though it has often been argued that his silent attitude towards the horrors in the Third Reich resulted from his earlier experience, and perhaps even friendships, in Germany. See *Cornwell* 1999; *Fattorini* 1992. About the significance of his years in Germany, see also *Chenaux* 2012.
  - 2 The main collections in the Vatican Secret Archives are *Archivio della Nunziatura in Monaco di Baviera* and *Archivio della Nunziatura in Berlino*. The conventional abbreviations of these archives are *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* and *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* but since this article frequently refers to these archives, in the main text is used shorter abbreviations ANM and ANB. The author of this essay worked for the ASV in 2002–2003. She organized the ANM and ANB prior to the opening of these collections for public. About Pacelli's letters in the other collections, see *Hinkel et al.* 2012, 28–29.

involved. All these problems were consequences of the First World War, after which the German Empire suffered territorial losses. There were, for example, issues between Germany and Poland on the northeastern front and between Germany and France regarding the territory of Alsace-Lorraine in the west.

### Eugenio Pacelli's way from Rome to Munich and Berlin – and back

Eugenio Maria Giuseppe Giovanni Pacelli was born in Rome on 2 March 1876. Following in the footsteps of other members of his family, who for generations had worked for the papal curia, Eugenio Pacelli decided to pursue an ecclesiastical career. He began his university studies in 1894 with an ambitious curriculum: theology, philosophy, history and modern languages. In 1899, after the broadly-schooled future pontiff finished his education with a degree in Theology, he continued his studies in Canon Law with a consecutive graduation in 1904. Parallel to his first graduation, Pacelli received priestly ordination on 2 April 1899. Through his family's good contacts in the Roman curia, Don Eugenio received in 1901 his first ecclesiastical employment. He was appointed as a trainee (*apprendista*) in the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs,<sup>3</sup> under the auspices of Monsignor Pietro Gasparri, the later cardinal and secretary of state.<sup>4</sup>

Pacelli made a good impression in the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs with the result that in 1904 he received a permanent position as *minutante*. Due to his degree in law, Cardinal Gasparri got Pacelli

---

3 From the perspective of foreign policies of the Holy See, the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs was the most central of all the eleven congregations. It was founded in 1814 and after the 1908 curial reform its main task was to discuss questions of religious-political nature and those questions which the pope or his cardinal secretary of state entrusted to the Congregation. Based on the discussions, votes and decisions of the cardinals involved in the meetings of the congregation, the pope was able to discover what his advisers' opinions on questions central to the ecclesiastical-politics of the Holy See were. S.RR.SS., AA.EE.SS., Stati Ecclesiastici, IV periodo, Pos. 305, Fasc. 34, f. 51r (Materie di competenza della Segreteria degli affari ecclesiastici straordinari N. 1291/38); *CIC 1917* 2001, Canon 255; *Regoli* 2010, 196, 198–199. On the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, see *Pettinaroli* 2010; *Regoli* 2010; *Regoli* 2013.

4 *Chenaux* 2003.

involved in the project of codification of canon law. The work was completed in 1916 and the Pio-Benedictine *Codex Iuris Canonici* was promulgated in May 1917.<sup>5</sup> Additionally, Pacelli was involved in maintaining the huge register of prisoners of the First World War in the Vatican, an interest he continued when he was stationed in Munich. During the years in the service of the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, Pacelli was entrusted with several important representative tasks and due to his legal background he specialized in concordats.<sup>6</sup>

Pacelli was considered as a strong candidate for becoming nuncio in Munich in January 1917 when nuncio Andreas Frühwirth was called to Rome. But the time was not right and Pope Benedict XV appointed Giuseppe Aversa instead. However, when Aversa died suddenly after an appendicitis operation in April 1917, after only three months into the position, Pope Benedict XV immediately appointed Pacelli as his successor. The appointment of Pacelli as nuncio in Bavaria took place on 23 April 1917 and since a papal nuncio had to belong to the episcopal rank, Pacelli received his episcopal ordination in Rome on 13 May, when he became titular Archbishop of Sardis.<sup>7</sup> Pacelli left Rome almost immediately after his ordination and arrived some days later in Bavaria, from where he sent his first telegram to Cardinal Gasparri announcing his safe arrival.<sup>8</sup> Some days later he reported to his superior about the presentation of his credentials to the local rulers.<sup>9</sup>

Pacelli arrived in Munich in a difficult moment. The Kingdom of Bavaria, together with other German states, was in a state of war – even though there was no imminent danger of war casualties in the city of Munich. It was important for the Vatican to send a nuncio to the Kingdom of Bavaria,

---

5 *CIC 1917* 2001. The law took legal effect from 19.5.1918 onwards and since then replaced the earlier collection, *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, which had its origins in the High Middle Ages with the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX (promulgated in 1234).

6 *Chenaux* 2003.

7 The episcopal see of Sardis was one of the Seven Churches of the Apocalypse, held by metropolitan bishops since the mid to late 1<sup>st</sup> century, with jurisdiction over the province of Lydia. After the Ottoman Turks conquered the town in 1306, the archbishops could no longer reside there and hence possessed the see only nominally, as so-called titular archbishops.

8 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 329, Fasc. 1, f. 39r (Secretary Torricella, on behalf of Pacelli, to Gasparri, 25.5.1917).

9 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 329, Fasc. 2, f. 7r (Pacelli to Gasparri, 29.5.1917) and ff. 8r–9v (Pacelli to Gasparri, 29.5.1917).

with which the Holy See had had unbroken diplomatic relations since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>10</sup> The importance of the presence of a papal nuncio in Munich lay in the fact that the Holy See had no diplomatic relations with the German Empire. The contacts between the Vatican and Germany had been broken off during the Napoleonic wars and had not been re-established due to the anticlerical policy (*Kulturkampf*) of the German *Reichskanzler* Otto von Bismarck in the last decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the nuncio in Bavaria had an important double role: firstly, he officially represented the papacy in Catholic Bavaria and, secondly, he functioned as an intermediary between the Holy See and the German Emperor. Thus, even though accredited only in Bavaria, Pacelli held responsibilities towards the other parts of Germany as well, which was crucially important for the Holy See and its attempts to create peace between the belligerent countries.

Even though Pope Benedict XV was excluded from the final peace negotiations after the First World War, he was actively promoting peace between the belligerent countries and Pacelli's role in the papal peace plans was to act as an intermediary towards the German side.<sup>12</sup> The First World War ended while Pacelli was in Munich. Germany surrendered to the Entente Powers in November 1918 and the peace treaty of Versailles was signed in June of the following year. As a consequence of the war Germany lost all its colonies and had to cede the territories of Alsace-Lorraine to France, Northern Schleswig to Denmark and Memel to Lithuania. Similarly, large parts of eastern Prussia were included in the new state of Poland. Additionally, the territory of Rhineland was demilitarized.<sup>13</sup>

At the same time, Germany had serious problems in its internal political situation due to the revolutions that resulted in the replacement of the imperial government with a republic immediately after the country had agreed to an armistice in November 1918. The papal nuncio in Munich faced difficult times during the revolution, especially during the short period of the antireligious Bavarian Soviet Republic (*Münchener Räterepublik*<sup>14</sup>),

---

10 About the history of the nunciature in Munich, see *De Marchi* 1957, 53–60.

11 About the *Kulturkampf* and its religious consequences, see for example *Gross* 2004; *Borutta* 2010.

12 About Pope Benedict XV's role in peace negotiations, see *Pollard* 1999. About Pacelli's role in promoting peace in Germany, see *Fattorini* 1992.

13 About the consequences of the treaty of Versailles, *Kraus* 2013.

14 About the *Räterepublik*, see for example *Mitchell* 1965.

which left an unforgettable impression on Pacelli and contributed to his fear of communists – a fact that has often been stressed when arguing in favour of his positive attitude towards the anti-communist Nazis.<sup>15</sup> The Germany where Pacelli was stationed did not only suffer from territorial losses and political unrest but was hit hard by financial crisis too.

The creation of the German Republic in the aftermath of the First World War meant a huge turn in the political situation in Germany. The Catholic *Zentrum* party<sup>16</sup> became a leading protagonist in politics and, accordingly, the Vatican changed its earlier suspicious attitude towards Germany. Berlin became attractive for the Vatican's foreign policy. The changed situation also led to the establishing of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and Germany. Pacelli was the self-evident candidate of the Holy See for the position of nuncio in Berlin, but since he had an unfinished mission<sup>17</sup> in Bavaria, he was unwilling to settle permanently in Berlin. Therefore, Pacelli received a double accreditation when he was appointed as papal nuncio to the German Reich on 16 April 1920. The papal nuncio in Germany divided his time between the Bavarian and German capitals for five years, until the concordat between the Vatican and Bavaria was concluded in May 1925 and Pacelli could finally concentrate on his duties as the nuncio in Berlin. In the German *Hauptstadt* Pacelli had a double role, since in 1920 he was also appointed as the nuncio of the Holy See for the state of Prussia. This task was, however, more nominal than practical since Prussia did not conduct an independent foreign policy.

Pacelli enjoyed his twelve-and-a-half years in Germany, especially the years in Bavaria, which he later often called the happiest of his life.<sup>18</sup> On 10 December 1929, Pacelli gave his farewell speech to the Germans. He had been called back to Rome where he was created cardinal on 16 December and two months later, on 7 February 1930, Pope Pius XI appointed Pacelli as his secretary of state.<sup>19</sup> Pacelli's farewell to the Germans in 1929 was cordial

---

15 *Cornwell* 1999.

16 *Fattorini* 1986.

17 Pacelli was one of the leading figures in the negotiation of a new concordat between the Vatican and the Bavaria, which was concluded only in May 1925 – after which Pacelli finally left his position in Bavaria and his successor, Bishop Alberto Vassallo di Torregrossa, arrived in Munich.

18 Pacelli was liked, or maybe even loved, by the Germans and he was very highly considered in different, be it political, societal or ecclesiastical, circles. Pacelli is even described as the “ideal of a papal nuncio”: he was ascetic, intelligent, diplomatically skilled, naturally authoritarian, and his priestly pioussness was exemplar. *Wolf & Unterburger* 2006, 14–16.

19 About the person and career of Eugenio Pacelli, see *Chenaux* 2003.

but his words were also full of excitement for his new central role in the papal administration: “My German mission has come to end. A bigger, more comprehensible [mission] in the spiritual and supernatural focus of the Universal Church is waiting. I return, where I came from. To the grave of the man of rock under the dome of Michelangelo, to the living Peter in Vatican. To be close to Peter means to be close to Christ.”<sup>20</sup>

### Role and tasks of the apostolic nuncio according to the nunciature archives of Pacelli

As papal nuncio Eugenio Pacelli was equivalent to an ambassador but he had a more comprehensive role both in political and ecclesiastical questions. He was sent by the Vatican as a legate to Germany, where he was the official representative of Pope Benedict XV, and acted as his liaison both to the political leaders and to the bishops. He was educated as a papal diplomat, but was first and foremost a priest. Thus, as papal nuncio Pacelli was not only the spokesman of the Vatican towards the local political and societal authorities, but his task was also to follow with interest ecclesiastical life and administration and to report to Rome about both matters.

Each papal nuncio was supposed to submit a final report of his activities at the end of his mission. Therefore, Pacelli composed on 18 November 1929 a report, which was directed to the Congregation of the Consistory. This document has been interpreted as a general representation of his mission and activity in Germany.<sup>21</sup> The report has been published and the editors, *Hubert Wolf* and *Klaus Unterburger*, stress on the basis of what was mentioned and discussed in it that Pacelli was first and foremost interested in ecclesiastical aspects (*cura animarum*) of his mission rather than in political issues.<sup>22</sup> In fact, the report of Pacelli does not include information on the political situation in inter-war Germany or contain comments about the central political figures of the Reich – even though the report ends with a long

---

20 “Meine deutsche Mission ist zu Ende. Eine größere, umfassendere am geistigen und übernatürlichen Brennpunkt der universalen Kirche hebt an. Ich kehre zurück, wovon ich ausgegangen bin. Zu dem Grab des Felsenmannes unter der Kuppel Michelangelos, zu dem lebendigen Petrus im Vatikan. Nahe bei Petrus stehen heißt nahe bei Christus sein.” Pacelli’s farewell speech is cited in *Wolf & Unterburger* 2006, 13.

21 The report of Pacelli is edited by *Wolf & Unterburger* 2006.

22 *Wolf & Unterburger* 2006, especially p. 53: “Der Aufbau von Pacellis Bericht und die Auswahl der darin behandelten Gegenstände geben einen vorzüglichen Einblick in seine Gedankenwelt und seine Wertmaßstäbe.”

and detailed description of personal facts about the German bishops and an evaluation of their vices and virtues.<sup>23</sup>

A particularly important fact in the evaluation of the report of Pacelli – which *Wolf* and *Unterburger* also underline<sup>24</sup> – is that the report certainly reflects Pacelli's impressions of the situation in Germany, but that the form (and thereby also the content) of the report may rather reflect the expectations of the Congregation of the Consistory, which was dealing with matters of ecclesiastical administration and episcopacy,<sup>25</sup> rather than an overall impression of Pacelli about the situation in Germany. It is arguable that the content of the report might even have been different and more politically oriented if Pacelli had composed it for example for the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, which was interested in political questions. Therefore, I find it premature to conclude on the basis of the content of the report that Pacelli was primarily interested in ecclesiastical questions.

The lack of comments regarding political questions in Pacelli's report is in fact striking because political issues must have formed a large part of the daily business of the nuncio in Bavaria and Germany – especially since Pacelli was a key figure in the Vatican's negotiations for concordats. First he was involved in the conclusion of the concordat with the Bavarian government on 29 March 1924 and later with the Prussian government on 14 June 1929 – not to mention Pacelli's large influence on the concordat between the Holy See and the German Reich. This so-called *Reichskonkordat* was signed by Pacelli himself in the role of the cardinal secretary of state on the part of the Vatican and Franz von Papen, the Vice-Chancellor of the German Reich, on the part of the German government on 20 July 1933.<sup>26</sup>

But was Pacelli primarily interested in ecclesiastical questions and how much did he deal with political issues? The report of Pacelli does not give an answer to these questions, but it is possible to examine the situation on the basis of the overall content of the archives of the apostolic nunciatures

---

23 S.RR.SS., AA.EE.SS., Germania, IV periodo, Pos. 511, Fasc. 24, ff. 3r–49v, on the German bishops, ff. 38r–49v, edited in *Wolf & Unterburger* 2006, 96–257, on the German bishops pp. 218–255.

24 *Wolf & Unterburger* 2006, 53.

25 The Congregation of the Consistory (nowadays known as the Congregation for Bishops) deals with matters that relate to the establishment and provision of the particular churches as well as with the exercise of Episcopal Office in the Latin Church, except for the issues belonging to the jurisdiction of the Congregation for the Evangelization. *CIC 1917* 2001, Canon 248.

26 About the *Reichskonkordat*, its interpretation and consequences see, *Brechenmacher* (ed.) 2007.

in Munich and Berlin from the times when Pacelli was acting as nuncio. These collections, *Archivio della Nunziatura in Monaco di Baviera* (ANM)<sup>27</sup> and *Archivio della Nunziatura in Berlino* (ANB)<sup>28</sup>, are both separate archives in the collections of the Vatican Secret Archives but in practice they form only one entity, which gives a full picture of all activities and tasks of Pacelli during his twelve-and-a-half-year mission in Germany.<sup>29</sup> Unlike the archives of some of his predecessors, the archives of Pacelli are extremely rich in material. Furthermore, the study of the content of his archives is easy, since they are in perfect order – probably because of the meticulous character of the nuncio.<sup>30</sup>

Originally, each papal nuncio could organize his archives according to his own standards, but the art of archiving became more and more regulated by the central administration of the Church in the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The archives of Pacelli follow the preferred style of the Holy See and are subdivided into 15 positions (*posizioni*) of which each contains documentation relevant to a certain larger subject, which makes it easy to analyse the activity of the nuncio on the basis of the archives. The argumentation is based on the idea that the more material there is about a subject in the nunciature archives, the more relevant the subject has been in the activity of the nuncio. In what follows, the content of the archives of the nunciature in Munich and then of the nunciature in Berlin will be discussed.

---

27 The documentation from the period of Pacelli as the nuncio in Munich consists of 109 relatively large boxes (in Italian: *scatole*) of material (ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 307–416). About the content of the ANM, see *Indice 1096A* 2003; *Indice 1096B* 2003.

28 The documentation from the period of Pacelli as the nuncio in Munich consists of 101 relatively of material. About the content of the ANB, see *Indice 1196* 2003.

29 Pacelli has had only one protocol book for his mission in Germany and therefore his correspondence followed one and the same numeration of letters whether they are archived in the ANM or in the ANB. The division between the ANM and the ANB is therefore somewhat arbitrary, but in principle the documentation regarding Pacelli's mission in Munich is preserved in the ANM and the documentation regarding his mission in Berlin in the ANB. The most overlapping between the two archives is from those years when he held the double accreditation, that is, 1920–1925. About Pacelli's archives, see *Salonen* 2003.

30 The fact that there are only 34 boxes of material from the nunciature of the first nuncio in Munich, Francesco Serra Cassano (1817–1826), puts into perspective the great amount of material in Pacelli's archives (109 + 101 boxes) a hundred years later. See *Salonen* 2003, 606–607.

**Table 1. The division of the archival material of Pacelli in the ANM.<sup>31</sup>**

Pos.	Subject	Boxes (Scatole)	
I	Santa Sede	307–312	6
II	Contabilità, sussidi	313–325	13
III	Corrispondenza coi privati, raccomandazioni, nunziatura	326–332	7
IV	Istanze, dispense e facoltà	333–334	2
V	Sovrani	335	0.5
VI	Ministeri, corpo diplomatico	335	0.5
VII	Questioni politiche	336–344	9
VIII	Dicasteri di curia	345–346	2
IX	(This position does not exist in the ANM)	-	0
X	Diocesi Bavaresi	347–351	5
XI	Ordini e congregazioni	352–353	2
XII	Questioni scolastiche e sociali	354–357	4
XIII	Guerra Europea	358–388	31
XIV	Pace, questioni politiche	389–402, 410–415	20
XV	Varie	403–406	4
-	Other	407–409	3

As the number of boxes in different positions, presented in Table 1, demonstrates, certain kinds of issues clearly demanded more attention of the nuncio than others. The position XIII: *Guerra Europea* (European War), which contains material concerning the First World War, occupies the largest space in the ANM, altogether 31 boxes. Most of the boxes contain documentation regarding prisoners of war: letters to and from mainly Italian private persons searching for their family members who had been imprisoned during the war. Helping the prisoners was an activity in which Pacelli had already been involved while he worked in the papal curia. As the nuncio in Munich, he continued this activity in collaboration with the German office for prisoners of war (*kirchliche Kriegshilfe*) in Paderborn, an initiative under

<sup>31</sup> *Indice 1096A 2003.*

the auspices of the local Bishop and later Cardinal Karl Joseph Schulte.<sup>32</sup> In addition to private correspondence, the position contains also a small number of reports regarding other war-related matters in various countries, which were of interest to the Holy See.

War-related issues can also be found in the position XIV: *Pace, Questioni politiche* (Peace, Political questions), which in the ANM consists of 20 boxes. They contain documentation about the political aftermath of the First World War, such as correspondence regarding the peace negotiations and armistice but also material about the political situation in post-war Bavaria and Germany. Furthermore, the position includes documentation regarding the preparation of the concordat between Bavaria and the Holy See. Thus, its content is mainly of a political nature.

Political issues are at stake also in several other positions of the ANM. The archives include in the position VII: *Questioni politiche* (Political questions) nine boxes of material regarding political questions outside Bavaria, for example reports and correspondence about the political situation in post-revolution Russia and other countries involved in the First World War. Documentation regarding the discussions and problems in the German parliament as well as internal German politics are included in this position as well. Material about Pacelli's activity in political questions can additionally be found in box 335, where position V: *Sovrani* (Rulers) contains his correspondence with the Royal house of Bavaria, the Wittelsbach-family, and position VI: *Ministeri, Corpo diplomatico* (Ministers, Diplomatic corps) his correspondence with the political authorities in Bavaria as well as with the diplomatic corps in Munich. Despite its political appearance, most of the material in this box is actually courtesy correspondence.

Ecclesiastical administration is another relatively large category of material in the ANM. The six boxes in position I: *Santa Sede* (Holy See) contain documentation regarding the pope and the Holy See. In particular, there is material related to the "*Questione Romana*", i.e. to the political situation of the Vatican before the signing of the Lateran Treaty in 1929. Similarly, position I contains correspondence regarding gifts of German Catholics to the pope as well as papal benedictions and various papal decorations (*onorificenze*) granted to Germans. The two boxes of material in position VIII: *Dicasteri* (Dicasteries) include correspondence between the nunciature and various dicasteries of the Roman Curia. With thirteen boxes, position II:

---

32 Karl Joseph Schulte (1871–1941) was Bishop of Paderborn 1910–1920, Archbishop of Cologne 1920–1941, created Cardinal in 1921. *Borengässer* 1995.

*Contabilità, Sussidi* (Book-keeping, Subsidies) is the largest single position in the ANM regarding ecclesiastical administration. It contains material related to the financial administration of the Church and includes for example documentation about the money paid to the Holy See (*Messe*, Peter's Pence) as well as financial aid paid by the Holy See through the nunciature to German Catholics in need of help. In the disastrous economic situation after the First World War, the Church pursued large subsidiary activities in all Catholic countries and distributed financial support for needy Catholics.<sup>33</sup>

Ecclesiastical administration is also the main topic in the five boxes of material in position X: *Diocesi* (Dioceses). It contains documentation related to the diocesan administration in Bavaria<sup>34</sup> and to matters in which the Bavarian dioceses had contacted the nunciature either in order to inform the nuncio, to ask his advice or to contact the Holy See through the nunciature.

Material related to more local and personal ecclesiastical administration can be found in the two boxes of position IV: *Istanze* (Instances). It contains documentation about instances and matters of dispensations, because of which private persons turned to the nunciature, as well as correspondence related to faculties requested by the German clergy or episcopate. The supervision of local monasteries and members of religious orders was part of the ecclesiastical administration entrusted to the papal nuncio. The ANM therefore includes two boxes of material regarding religious orders in Bavaria, position XI: *Ordini* (Orders). This position includes correspondence between the nuncio and the members and representatives, both male and female, of the various religious orders. Similarly, position III: *Corrispondenza coi privati, Raccomandazioni, Nunziatura* (Correspondence with private persons, Recommendations, Nunciature) with seven boxes of material can be included in the category of ecclesiastical administration. Position III contains mainly correspondence between the nuncio and private persons as well as letters of recommendation written by the nuncio to various Bavarian Catholics – thus slightly similar material to what is in position IV. Furthermore, position III includes all administrative documentation regarding the nunciature, its personnel, building and various practicalities as well as material concerning the nuncio himself.

---

<sup>33</sup> Pollard 1999, 75–76, 111–115.

<sup>34</sup> The archives of Pacelli follow the division of the territory under the jurisdiction of the papal nuncio in Munich including the dioceses of Augsburg, Passau and Regensburg, which belonged to the province of Munich-Freising, and the dioceses of Eichstätt, Speyer and Würzburg, which belonged to the province of Bamberg. The dioceses covered thus the states of Bavaria, Baden and Württemberg.

Additionally, the ANM includes two positions, which do not contain material directly related to ecclesiastical administration or politics. Position XII: *Questioni scolastiche e sociali* (Scholastic and social questions) with four boxes consists of documentation regarding various types of educational and social issues. There is, for example, material about more general religious matters in Germany, about education (schools and university), about various social endeavors and about different religious associations. These questions were central for the Catholic Church, which aimed at guaranteeing Catholic education to all Catholic children. It was, indeed, one of Pacelli's main missions in Germany to defend Catholic education (*Bekennnisschule*) from the plans of the government to create a school system in which religious matters were not taken into consideration.<sup>35</sup>

Finally, the ANM includes four boxes belonging to position XV: *Varie* (Various), which contains mainly the nuncio's correspondence with private persons. Most of these persons wrote to Pacelli because they wanted to ask for a favour from the nuncio in the form of a certificate or simply ask for money, usually without success. This position contains also numerous, often anonymous, letters with a relatively dubious content. Additionally, there are three boxes (407–409) that do not directly relate to the activity of Pacelli but which for other reasons are included in the ANM.<sup>36</sup>

What can be said about the activity of Pacelli as the nuncio in Munich on the basis of the overall content of the ANM? First and foremost, the archival material demonstrates very clearly that political questions were one of the major concerns of the papal nuncio, since the amount of material related to the First World War and other political issues form the majority of the documentation, altogether 61 boxes out of 109. The great quantity of material related to political issues is, however, not surprising due to the ongoing First World War during Pacelli's first years in Munich as well as the political issues that had to be settled after the war and the conclusion of peace. The content of the ANM also shows that ecclesiastical administration clearly formed the other principal function of Pacelli with as many as 37 boxes of material. Despite the dominance of war, political issues and

<sup>35</sup> Wolf & Unterburger 2006, 76–78. See also Schulze 2013.

<sup>36</sup> The ANM contains three boxes of material (ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 407–409), which do not belong directly to any archival position. Box 407 contains material regarding the "Processo Ambrogetti – Gerlach", while boxes 408 and 409 contain correspondence regarding the nunciature in Munich that have been part of the archives of the *Zentrum*-politician and a close friend and informant of Pacelli, Matthias Erzberger. This material ended up in Pacelli's archive because the widow of Erzberger donated the material regarding the nunciature of Munich to Pacelli after the assassination of her husband in August 1921. See *Salonen* 2003, 606, note 17.

administration the content of the archives of Pacelli in Munich demonstrates that the nuncio used much time to communicate with the local Catholic population thus taking care of the cure of souls.

The period of Pacelli's time in Munich was, however, very special, in particular during the first years dominated by war and post-war events. Therefore, it is not wise to draw further conclusions about the activity of Pacelli as a nuncio solely on the basis of the content of the ANM, which mainly contains material from 1917 until the mid-1920s. In order to get a more complete picture of the activity of Pacelli, the content of the ANB, which mainly includes material from 1920 onwards, will be discussed below. It should thus give a more realistic picture of the usual activities of the nuncio, since the First World War no longer caused extra work for Pacelli while he was in Berlin.

**Table 2. The division of the archival material of Pacelli in the ANB.<sup>37</sup>**

Pos.	Subject	Boxes	
I	Santa Sede	1–4	4
II	Contabilità, sussidi	6–9	4
III	Corrispondenza, raccomandazioni, nunziatura, corpo diplomatico	10–22	13
IV	Istanze, dispense e facoltà	23–24	2
V	Sovrani	25	1
VI	Stampe	26	1
VII	Questioni politiche esterni	26–35	9
VIII	Dicastri di curia	36	1
IX	Azione cattolica	37	1
X	Diocesi tedesche	37–59	22
XI	Ordini e congregazioni	60–61	2
XII	Questioni scolastiche e sociali	62–76	15
XIII	Guerra Europea	77	1
XIV	Questioni politiche tedesche	78–92	15
XV	Varie	93–97	5
-		5, 98–101	5

<sup>37</sup> *Indice 1196* 2003. In principle, the different positions have the same content as in the ANM. In case of variation, the differences are explained in footnotes.

Indeed, as the numbers in Table 2 demonstrate the war-related material in the ANB, position XIII: *Guerra Europea* (First World War), consists of only one box. Other positions containing political questions, instead, remain quite substantial like position XIV: *Questioni politiche tedesche* (Political questions in Germany) with 15 boxes and position VII: *Questioni politiche esterni* (Political questions in other countries) with nine boxes. Additionally, there is one box in position V: *Sovrani* (Rulers) containing Pacelli's correspondence with the royal families of Germany. Altogether the ANB consists of 26 boxes of material with political content. This is much less than in the ANM, but the difference depends entirely on the lack of material related to the First World War in the ANB.

The number of boxes in various positions related to ecclesiastical administration is very different in the ANM and the ANB. The ANB contains 48 boxes of material concerning different aspects of ecclesiastical administration. There are four boxes in position I: *Santa Sede* (Holy See), two boxes in position IV: *Istanze, dispense e facoltà* (Instances, dispensations and faculties) and two boxes in position XI: *Ordini e congregazioni* (Orders and congregations). Furthermore, there is one box in position VIII: *Dicasteri di curia* (Curia dicasteries), which contains correspondence of the nuncio with the various administrative entities in the Roman curia. In position II: *Contabilità, sussidi* (Book-keeping, subsidies), which contains material related to financial administration within the Church, there are 4 boxes of material. Position X: *Diocesi tedeschi* (German dioceses) regarding the diocesan administration in Germany consists of 22 boxes of material and position III: *Corrispondenza, raccomandazioni, nunziatura, corpo diplomatico* (Correspondence, recommendations, nunciature, diplomatic corps), concerning different issues related to the nunciature of 13 boxes.

This means that the amount of material related to various administrative questions is suddenly much larger in the ANB than in the ANM. But the growth of the archival material is not even in all positions. In positions I, IV, VIII and IX the variation is very small or there is no difference at all between the two nunciature archives, but in positions II, III and X significant differences can be noted.

Position II regarding ecclesiastical finances in the ANB (4 boxes) is much smaller than in the ANM (13 boxes). A closer analysis of the content of this position in the ANM and in the ANB reveals the reason for the difference: the Munich material is full of documentation related to payments ("Messestipende" and Peter's pence), which the nuncio forwarded to the Holy See and which are absent in the Berlin material. This diminishing trend

results from a change in the financial administration of the Holy See after which the nuncios no longer had to report separately each payment to the Holy See.

In positions III and X the trend is reversed so that documentation is much richer in the ANB than in the ANM. In position III regarding the nunciature, the difference is not huge (7 boxes in the ANM against 13 boxes in the ANB) but nevertheless significant. This difference can be explained by the fact that in the ANB position III contains three boxes of correspondence regarding the diplomatic corps, which in the ANM is included in position VI. Additionally, there is one box regarding the renovation of the house of the nunciature in Berlin before Pacelli moved in and one box regarding the earlier nuncio in Munich, Cardinal Andreas Frühwirth, which should, in fact, belong to his nunciature archive.

The biggest difference between the ANM and the ANB can be seen in the amount of material in position X regarding the diocesan administration. In the ANM this position consists of five boxes, while the ANB contains as many as 22 boxes. This growth too can easily be explained by changing circumstances: the jurisdiction of the nuncio in Munich included only eight Bavarian archdioceses or dioceses,<sup>38</sup> while as the nuncio in Berlin, Pacelli was responsible for all dioceses in the whole German Reich (Bavaria excluded), which amount to almost 20.<sup>39</sup> Despite the division of labour between Pacelli in Berlin and Vassallo di Torregrossa in Munich, the ANB includes also material related to the Bavarian dioceses as well as some material regarding the whole German ecclesiastical territory, such as documentation regarding the yearly episcopal conferences organized in Fulda.<sup>40</sup>

It can be concluded that in light of what the content of the ANM and the ANB can reveal about Pacelli's activities as nuncio, it becomes clear that ecclesiastical administration and political matters relevant to the Catholic Church occupied a great quantity of time of the nuncio. This means that these questions must have been important for the nuncio and, consequently,

---

38 The dioceses of Augsburg, Passau and Regensburg belonged to the province of Munich-Freising and the dioceses of Eichstätt, Speyer and Würzburg belonged to the province of Bamberg.

39 The list of the other German dioceses (archdioceses are marked in bold) is long: Berlin, **Breslau** (Wrocław), **Cologne**, Culm (Chełmno), Ermland (Warmia), **Freiburg**, Fulda, **Gnesen-Posen** (Gniezno-Poznań), Hildesheim, Limburg, Mainz, Meissen, Münster, Osnabrück, **Paderborn**, Rottenburg and Trier. Additionally, the papal nuncio in Germany was responsible for the areas of Apostolic Administration of Tütz/Schneidemühl (Piła) on the German-Polish border area.

40 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 38: "Mons. E. Pacelli; Conferenze Fulda", with three fascicoli and over 900 pages of material.

it is correct to argue that the content of the final report of Pacelli does not fully reflect his activities and interests during his German mission.

When evaluating the activity of Pacelli in Germany, it is also important to stress that the nunciature archives, which preserve only written documentation, do not give a full picture of the daily activities of the nuncio. It does not include any information on the content of the conversations and meetings or of various spiritual exercises and other religious activities of the nuncio during his German mission. The beneficence of the German nuncio should not be forgotten either. The correspondence regarding the prisoners of war and especially Pacelli's reports to the cardinal secretary of state about his visits to various prisoner camps tell us clearly that the papal nuncio was deeply concerned about the physical and religious well-being of Catholics around him.<sup>41</sup> Therefore, it can be concluded that the field of interaction of Pacelli must have been more comprehensive than what the information based on the content of his archives and especially his final report can reveal.

### Political, national and linguistic issues in the activity of Pacelli

As the content of Pacelli's archives demonstrated, political issues formed a large part of his daily business both in Munich and in Berlin, which is not a surprise because the outcome of the First World War resulted in several political changes in Germany and affected the religious policy of the Holy See. In what follows some political issues are discussed in which Pacelli was involved because the nuncio had to monitor the interests of the Holy See in the new political situation. The purpose of this chapter is not to describe all political issues in inter-war Germany relevant to the Vatican, such as the Ruhr crisis, because it would be too large a task to discuss in depth and it has been done by others. Instead, the following focuses on the role of Pacelli in three major conflict situations, which are well-documented in ANM or ANB, namely the situation in Alsace-Lorraine, in the territory of Saar and in Upper Silesia.

---

41 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 358–374, 375, 378–380 contain correspondence regarding the prisoners of war, while ANM contains over 2000 pages in which there is information about Pacelli's visits to various camps, among which for example Fürstenfeldbruck, Halle, Minden, Cellelager, Münster, Ellwangen and Lechfeld, which Pacelli visited in 1918.

## Alsace-Lorraine

One of the difficult questions in the western border area between France and Germany after the First World War was the destiny of Alsace-Lorraine. The territory of Alsace-Lorraine had been created in 1871 after the Germans had conquered the area as the consequence of the Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871). The annexation of the territory by Germany in 1870 had been much debated both by the reluctant inhabitants of the territory and by the majority of Germans.<sup>42</sup> The annexation had not altered only the border between Germany and France but also the confines of dioceses and ecclesiastical provinces and thus it had become an ecclesiastical issue as well. For example, the diocese of Metz had administratively belonged to the French province of Besançon but when large parts of the diocese had become part of Alsace-Lorraine and annexed to Germany, the juridical status of the diocese had to be reconsidered. The problem had been solved in the way that the diocese had been extracted from the province of Besançon and it had become an immediate subject of the Holy See.<sup>43</sup>

During the First World War, the German government planned to create a more permanent system of autonomous administration in Alsace-Lorraine, but the plans met resistance among the French population. This was the context in which Pacelli got involved in the issue of Alsace-Lorraine. In August 1917, Pacelli contacted Diego von Bergen, the representative of the imperial government in Berlin, and asked the Germans to suspend the plans for autonomous administration.<sup>44</sup> The reason behind Pacelli's request was that the cardinal secretary of state, Pietro Gasparri, had been informed about the German plans by the French Catholics who opposed to the idea of autonomous administration in Alsace-Lorraine. The Cardinal was concerned about the situation in the territory but needed more information about the situation and especially about the real intentions of the German government before he was ready to take any action. Indeed, his prudence was reasonable, since it turned out that there was no need to worry about the situation. Due to internal political difficulties, the plans for the self-government of Alsace-Lorraine did not proceed in the German government at a quick pace, as the *Zentrum* party leader Matthias Erzberger informed Pacelli at the

---

42 About the Franco-Prussian War, see *Howard* 1991; *Wawro* 2003.

43 *Lins* 1911.

44 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 343, Fasc. 1, f. 2r (Pacelli to Gasparri, 24.8.1917), f. 3r (Gasparri to Pacelli, 30.8.1917), ff. 4r, 5r (Pacelli to von Bergen, 31.8.1917).

turn of September and October 1917. Pacelli forwarded this message to his superior.<sup>45</sup>

The situation remained relatively calm until the autumn but in mid-September the Bishop of Metz, Willibrord Benzler, who opposed the German plans, requested help from the Holy See. Bishop Benzler was concerned about the plans not only for political reasons but especially because they would affect the ecclesiastical administration in his diocese and he desired to get the situation clarified.<sup>46</sup> Since the Vatican was concerned about the ecclesiastical implications of the situation, the cardinal secretary of state decided to act. Cardinal Gasparri wrote to Pacelli on 13 October and asked for more information on the situation, especially concerning the real plans of the German government.<sup>47</sup> Pacelli acted immediately after the letter of his superior had arrived and sent a letter to Matthias Erzberger in Berlin asking for a new report on the situation.<sup>48</sup> On the basis of the information sent to him by Erzberger, Pacelli replied to the Cardinal two weeks later, on 29 October, with a long report on the issue of Alsace-Lorraine in the German politics.<sup>49</sup> The information from Pacelli assured the Holy See that despite the alarmism of the Bishop of Metz, nothing new had happened with the plans and hence there was no immediate danger in the matter.

The question of Alsace-Lorraine became topical again in January 1918, after the *Comité de l'indépendance de l'Alsace-Lorraine* had contacted the Vatican with a suggestion regarding the solution of the situation of Alsace-Lorraine. The cardinal secretary of state used the same *modus operandi* as earlier in the question: he wrote to Pacelli. This time Cardinal Gasparri not only requested for information about the current situation in the territory but he also asked whether the German nuncio considered it important for the Holy See to act on the matter.<sup>50</sup> Pacelli, again, redirected the request of his superior to Erzberger<sup>51</sup>, who sent Pacelli several reports in which he summarized the situation.<sup>52</sup> Pacelli, in turn, sent Gasparri a report, where he

45 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 343, Fasc. 1, ff. 8r, 9r (Erzberger to Pacelli, 29.9.1917), ff. 10r, 11r (Erzberger to Pacelli, 6.10.1917).

46 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 343, Fasc. 1, ff. 70r–71v (Benzler to Gasparri, 18.9.1917). Edited in *Kritische Online-Edition* [s.a.]. Dokument 3340.

47 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 343, Fasc. 1, f. 73r–v (Gasparri to Pacelli, 13.10.1917). Edited in *Kritische Online-Edition* [s.a.]. Dokument 7280.

48 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 343, Fasc. 1, f. 74r (Pacelli to Erzberger, 18.10.1917).

49 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 343, Fasc. 1, ff. 75r–80r (Pacelli to Gasparri, 29.10.1917). Edited in *Kritische Online-Edition* [s.a.]. Dokument 2211.

50 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 343, Fasc. 1, f. 233r (Gasparri to Pacelli, 12.1.1918).

51 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 343, Fasc. 1, f. 234r (Pacelli to Erzberger, 18.1.1918).

52 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 343, Fasc. 1, ff. 236r, 237r (Erzberger to Pacelli, 22.1.1918).

answered the questions posed by the Cardinal: the plans for self-government of Alsace-Lorraine would not pass through in the current political atmosphere in Germany and therefore there was no reason to take steps on the issue.<sup>53</sup> The Holy See followed this advice and did not react in any way. In fact, the question of self-government of the territory was never solved but discussions continued for several years, even after the territory was re-annexed to France as consequence of the First World War.<sup>54</sup>

As the nunciature documentation demonstrates, Pacelli's main role in this question was merely that of obtaining necessary information from his local contacts, especially from Matthias Erzberger, and to forward that to his superior so that the Holy See would have the necessary basis for decision-making on the issue. The correspondence between Cardinal Gasparri and Pacelli demonstrates too, that the personal opinion of the nuncio was highly appreciated in the Roman Curia and had an effect upon its decision-making.

### The destiny of the territory of the Saar Basin

Another political and nationalistic disputes, in which Pacelli as nuncio in Germany was involved, concerned the question about the destiny of the territory of the Saar Basin. Between the years 1920 and 1935, the territory was governed, under a mandate of the League of Nations according to the Treaty of Versailles, by British and French occupation troops which caused tension in the territory. The intervention of Pacelli was requested concerning two issues. Firstly, he was involved in discussions regarding the tensions which resulted from the negative attitude of the local population towards the French troops with foreign and especially black soldiers, who were often described as extremely brutal. Secondly, his opinion was needed when the borders of ecclesiastical administration in the territory were discussed after the mutation of the state borders.<sup>55</sup>

The presence of the occupation troops drew the attention of the ecclesiastical administration in the Saar Basin even though the issue had, in principle, nothing to do with the Church. The reason why the Catholic Church was involved in the discussions was that the local clergy got involved

---

53 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 343, Fasc. 1, f. 303r–v (Pacelli to Gasparri, 25.1.1918).

54 About the position of Alsace-Lorraine between France and Germany, see *Baechler* 2008; *Höpel* 2014.

55 For the occupation of the territory of Ruhr, see *Fattorini* 1992, 265–285; *Jeannesson* 1998; *Fischer* 2003.

in the tensions. The clerics found it difficult to remain impartial, when they heard about how foreign soldiers were maltreating their parishioners. In this situation, the local clergy requested the Holy See's help to put pressure on the French government so that it would send the black troops away. In order to obtain support from the Holy See, the clergy of the territory of the Saar Basin turned to nuncio Pacelli, whom they considered as their superior. The clergy informed the nuncio about the misconduct of the occupation troops in the territory and asked Pacelli to forward their appeals and testimonies to the Holy See, which Pacelli did. In most of the cases, however, there was a question about racism and pure national (i.e. German) interest behind these complaints, which Pacelli also underlined to the cardinal secretary of state to whom he forwarded the documentation. His opinion was apparently heard in the Vatican, since the Holy See did not want to take a position and officially react to these complaints.<sup>56</sup>

The Holy See was instead, much more interested about what would happen to the ecclesiastical administration in the occupied territory. The concern of the Holy See lay in the fact that parts of the territory of the Saar Basin, now in the French hands, belonged to German dioceses: partly to the diocese of Trier and partly to the diocese of Speyer. In order to diminish the German ecclesiastical influence in the territory, the French government made attempts to separate the territory from the German dioceses by suggesting the creation of an independent apostolic administration for the territory.<sup>57</sup> When the bishops of Trier and Speyer heard about such plans, they became worried about the loss of German influence (and their own jurisdiction) in the territory and opposed the idea. In order to get their opinion to the Holy See the bishops approached the nunciature in Munich and asked the nuncio to forward their objections with a detailed report about the situation to the Holy See.<sup>58</sup>

The Vatican secretariat of state analysed the documentation and asked Pacelli to inform the bishops of the opinion of the Holy See: the fear of the German bishops seemed to be unfounded, since the French ecclesiastical

<sup>56</sup> For example, ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 414, Fasc. 1, f. 9r (Pacelli to Gasparri, 26.4.1920), f. 12r–v (Pacelli to Gasparri, 7.3.1921).

<sup>57</sup> For example, ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 56r (Gasparri to Pacelli, 10.10.1921), ff. 69r–71v (Pacelli to Gasparri, 27.10.1921), f. 72r (Gasparri to Pacelli, 8.11.1921), f. 74r (Pacelli to Gasparri, 23.11.1921), f. 79r (Gasparri to Pacelli, 14.12.1921). The problem is also mentioned by *Morsey* 1977, 121.

<sup>58</sup> ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 17r (Pacelli to Gasparri, 22.8.1919) and ff. 4r, 5r, 6r, 7r, 8r, 9r, 10r, 11r, 12r, 13r–14v (the respective attachments).

authorities had not even contacted the Holy See with such plans.<sup>59</sup> Pacelli forwarded this notice to Bishop Ludwig Sebastian of Speyer with the wish to inform the almost 80-year-old and seriously ill Bishop Michael Felix Korum of Trier as well.<sup>60</sup> Despite the assurances of the papal nuncio, rumors about French attempts to create an independent ecclesiastical territory in the Saar spread in Germany and caused unrest. In order to calm the minds, Pacelli wrote to Gasparri in late November 1919 and asked again whether the French government had contacted the Holy See in this respect.<sup>61</sup> In his reply a few weeks later, Cardinal Gasparri confirmed the content of his previous letter stating that the French government had not approached the Holy See with such intentions.<sup>62</sup>

The situation calmed down for a while, but misinterpretations and distrust arose again two years later, in 1921, when P. Dugout S.J., a chaplain of the French army, visited Rome and the Vatican. The Germans interpreted the visit of P. Dugout as a sign of negotiations between France and the Holy See about the future of the Saar and became nervous. As soon as Cardinal Gasparri realized this, he attempted to calm down the fears of the Germans by sending Pacelli a report of their meeting. The report showed that the conversations between Dugout and the representatives of the Holy See had not even touched the subject of creating a new diocese in the territory. Furthermore, the Cardinal underlined that even if the French government were to suggest the creation of an independent apostolic administration in the Saar Basin, the Holy See would oppose to that.<sup>63</sup> After receiving the letter of his superior, Pacelli immediately informed Bishop Sebastian about this and advised him not to take any action in the matter.<sup>64</sup>

The discussions about the fate of the ecclesiastical administration in the territory took a new turn in October 1921. The cardinal secretary of state wrote to Pacelli and sent to his attention a *Mémoire*, composed by the French administration in the Saar, in which it requested the Holy See to send an apostolic administrator to the territory.<sup>65</sup> Pacelli redirected the information immediately to the dioceses of Trier and Speyer, which took immediate action.

---

59 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 26r (Gasparri to Pacelli, 7.9.1919).

60 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 27r (Pacelli to Sebastian, 23.9.1919).

61 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 37r–v (Pacelli to Gasparri, 28.11.1919). The notices about the French attempts came in the first place from Erzberg. ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, ff. 38r, 39r (Erzberg to Pacelli 28.11.1919).

62 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 41r (Gasparri to Pacelli, 12.12.1919).

63 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, ff. 53r–54r (Gasparri to Pacelli, 13.5.1921).

64 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 55r (Pacelli to Sebastian, 3.7.1921).

65 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 56r (Gasparri to Pacelli, 10.10.1921) and ff. 57r–60r (the *Mémoire* as attachment).

Bishop Sebastian of Speyer thanked the nuncio for the announcement and described to Pacelli in moving words, how his letter, dated on 13 October, had arrived to both of the bishoprics after which the vicar general of Speyer, Monsignor Molz, had travelled to Trier to meet the old Bishop Korum, who had formulated a response to the Holy See.<sup>66</sup> According to the Bishop of Speyer, the composing of the letter had been too much for his 81-year-old colleague in Trier. Because he had become so mentally agitated, the health of Bishop Korum had deteriorated during the following night to the degree that he had to be administered the last unction. Bishop Korum, fortunately, recovered and for the first thing the following morning, he re-read the draft of the letter but had no more strength to work with it further.<sup>67</sup> Both bishops argued in their letters addressed to the Holy See that the request for sending an apostolic administrator to the Saar did not derive from religious needs but from the political zeal of the French government and thus was absolutely not to be recommended.<sup>68</sup>

Pacelli forwarded the answers of the German bishops to the Holy See together with a letter in which he replied to Cardinal Gasparri. The German nuncio stressed in his letter that it would create a very bad impression in Germany if the Holy See were to agree to the request of the French government, especially because the German government had already been obliged to approve a similar solution in the eastern border area.<sup>69</sup> According to Pacelli, an insistence on the behalf of the Holy See would endanger the concordat negotiations between the Vatican and Bavaria – not to mention the possible future concordatory negotiations with the German Reich.<sup>70</sup>

66 Copy in ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 61r–v (Korum to the Pope, 18.10.1921).

67 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 63r–v (Sebastian to Pacelli, 20.10.1921): “Die 81jährige Bischof setzte eigenhändig sofort beiliegendes Schreiben auf, wurde jedoch dabei von einer so starken Erregung befallen, dass ihm in der folgenden Nacht die hl. Oelung gespendet werden musste. - - Und als verschiedene Medikamente ihm etwas Kräftigung verschafft hatten, liess er sich am Morgen nochmals den Wortlaut seiner Erwiderung genau vorlesen, indes zu einem ausführlicheren Gutachten reichten die Kräfte nicht mehr hin. Sein beiliegendes Schreiben ist somit wie ein letzter Wille dieses hochverdienten, treuen Kirchenfürsten.”

68 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, ff. 63r–67r (Sebastian to Pacelli, 20.10.1921) and f. 61r–v (copy of Korum to the Pope, 18.10.1921).

69 The tense situation in the German-Polish border areas was solved by creating an independent ecclesiastical administrative area in the territory where the old diocesan borders of the now Polish Archdiocese of Gniezno-Poznań and the Diocese of Culm were on the German side of the border. The territories on the German side were united in 1922 and on 1 of May 1923, a separate Apostolic Administration directly subordinate to the Holy See was erected with Robert Weimann as the first Apostolic Administrator of **Tütz**. In 1927 the seat of the administration was moved to Schneidemühl (Piła). ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 50, Fascs. 3–4, 6–7.

70 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, ff. 69r–71v (Pacelli to Gasparri, 24.10.1921).

The observations of Pacelli were carefully listened to in the Roman Curia, since the Cardinal secretary of state thanked him for his opinion and stated that he fully agreed and that it would be premature to hasten the negotiations about the creation of an apostolic administration in the territory of the Saar.<sup>71</sup> In fact, the plans were never realized, but nevertheless the issue occupied the papal nuncio during the first years of 1920s. There still existed in 1925 controversies about the ecclesiastical administration of the area, for example regarding the right to appoint priests to the parishes.<sup>72</sup>

As could be seen, Pacelli, again, had a double role in this issue. Firstly, he transmitted material from the local ecclesiastical authorities to the Vatican, so that the Holy See would have a better basis to make decisions, as well as from the Vatican to the local authorities in cases when it was necessary to communicate something. Secondly, as the letter of the cardinal secretary of state to Pacelli demonstrated, the opinion of Pacelli was highly appreciated by his superiors. It became also evident in the correspondence of Pacelli, that he had his own opinions, independent from the often very subjective, and at times even politically or nationally biased, information he forwarded to the Roman Curia on behalf of the local ecclesiastics. Especially in this case we can see how the interest of Pacelli for the conclusion of the concordats with both Bavaria and the German Reich affected his opinion upon other ecclesiastical matters.

### Upper Silesia

A third controversial issue, in which Pacelli was involved, was the question of the creation of the Polish Republic and the consecutive loss of territories for Germany. In principle, the papal nuncio in Warsaw was the key figure in dealing with the situation, since it concerned Polish territory,<sup>73</sup> but as the papal representative in Germany Pacelli followed closely the political discussion about the creation of the Polish Republic and its implications, especially issues which affected the ecclesiastical life and administration.<sup>74</sup>

---

71 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, f. 72r (Gasparri to Pacelli, 8.11.1921).

72 See, for example, ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Monaco* 414, Fasc. 3, ff. 81r–84r, 85r–87r, 89r–90r, 93r–94r, 95r–97r, 98r–99r, 100r–101v. About the later developments in the area, see *Levant* 2013.

73 The papal nuncio in Warsaw, Achille Ratti (future Pope Pius XI) was appointed the ecclesiastical commissioner in Upper Silesia until the situation had been settled in 1921/2. His mission, however, ended prematurely. See for example *Hinkel* 2010.

74 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 35, Fascs. 1–7.

The question of Upper Silesia was important for the Vatican because the old diocesan borders did not coincide the new boundaries between Germany and Poland, and the ecclesiastical administration had to be reorganized in the border areas, which had previously belonged to Germany and been administered by German bishops.

The situation of the diocese of Breslau, which covered the territory of Upper Silesia in the border area between Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia, was the most problematic. After the First World War, the eastern parts of the territory were ceded to Poland but the rest remained part of the German Reich. The division was, however, not satisfactory and caused political incidents between the Polish-speaking minority and the German-speaking majority. Additionally, Czechoslovakia had claims on the southern areas of the province. The controversies escalated into violent attacks, like the Polish-Czechoslovak War (1919) and the Silesian Uprisings (1919–1921). The situation was finally solved in 1921, when the province of Upper Silesia was divided into three parts: a small part of the province in the south (Ratibor) was ceded to Czechoslovakia, the eastern parts to Poland and the rest, including the diocese of Breslau which was the centre of ecclesiastical administration in the territory, remained German. The new border was drawn according to the linguistic majority in the area, while in bilingual areas the division was made after a referendum. The result was ratified on 15 May 1921 when the German-Polish Accord on East Silesia was signed in Geneva.<sup>75</sup>

The border changes and the tense political situation also affected ecclesiastical life and administration, which caused extra work for the papal representatives. The situation in the diocese of Breslau was especially tense, since the local Bishop, Cardinal Adolf Bertram – probably the most powerful ecclesiastical figure in Germany, in the role of the chairman of the episcopal conference in Germany – was politically oriented towards Germany and did not hide his anti-Polish tendencies.<sup>76</sup> As many documents and direct complaints in the archives of Pacelli demonstrate, the very open pro-German attitude of Bertram only made the difficult situation worse. The Polish population in the German parts of Upper Silesia opposed the attitude

---

75 About the situation in Upper Silesia, see for example *Gromada* 1979; *Fattorini* 1992, 231–264.

76 About Bertram and his pro-German policy, see *Sierpowski* 1988; *Hinkel* 2010. See also ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 35, Fasc. 4, ff. 1–69: “Lamenti dei Polacchi contro gli ecclesiastici tedeschi”; ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42, Fascs. 1–5. A similar tense situation occurred between the German and Polish speaking inhabitants of the Free City of Danzig, as discussed in the essay by *Suvi Kansikas* (pp. xx–xxx).

of the German Cardinal, who caused a lot of anger with his political activity and statements, in the resolving of which Pacelli also got involved.<sup>77</sup>

One of the difficult issues for Bertram was the fact that the commission governing the territory of Upper Silesia did not allow him to access all the areas (i.e. the Polish ones) of his diocese, where he should have fulfilled his duties as bishop, such as taking care of the confirmation of the children and the consecration of churches.<sup>78</sup> This problem, too, required Pacelli's intervention, when the locals asked for his help. He transmitted to the Holy See a request for the intervention of the Vatican with the Polish government in order to facilitate the Cardinal's access to the territory.<sup>79</sup>

Pacelli played only a minor role in resolving the question of Upper Silesia, since most correspondence about the situation took place between the Holy See and Cardinal Bertram and the apostolic nuncio in Warsaw, Achille Ratti, who were the key persons in this question. As nuncio in Germany, Pacelli followed closely both the political situation in Upper Silesia as well as the discussions concerning the borders of the diocese of Breslau. He also very carefully tried to avoid taking part in the difficult situation, a fact which he even directly mentioned to Ratti in his letter.<sup>80</sup> Pacelli fulfilled, however, his duties as nuncio in Germany by transmitting to Rome different letters, memoranda and messages, which the local politicians and other persons

---

77 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42, Fasc. 1, ff. 124r (Gasparri to Pacelli (telegram), 15.8.1922) and 125r (Pacelli to Gasparri (telegram), 17.8.1922). Bertram even ignored the recommendation of his superiors to calm down the difficult situation in his diocese between the German- and Polish-speaking clerus and published a *decretum* which caused a lot of anger on the Polish side, up to the point that the Polish government considered breaking off diplomatic relationships between the countries. This caused anger in the Vatican and the cardinal secretary of state had to intervene and rebuke his German colleague. ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42, Fasc. 1, f. 84r–v (Decretum of Bertram, 25.11.1920); ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42, Fasc. 2, ff. 4r, 5r, 6r, 7r (copy of Gasparri to Bertram, 8.12.1920). Even though Pacelli was not officially involved in the conflict between the Holy See and the Cardinal, he was kept well informed about the situation, as can be seen from the numerous documents in his archives: ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42, Fasc. 1, ff. 84r–85r, 87r, 88r; Fasc. 2, ff. 2r, 4r, 5r, 6r, 7r, 8r–10r, 11r–v, 16r. About the actions of Cardinal Bertram, see also *Hinkel* 2010. About the problematic situation between Ratti and Bertram, see also *Bergström* 2015, 29–30.

78 For example, ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42, Fasc. 1, ff. 22r–23v (Bertram to Pacelli, 14.8.1920).

79 For example, correspondence between local representatives, Pacelli and the Holy See in the matter: ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42, Fasc. 1, ff. 56r, 58r, 59r, 60r, 61r, 62r–63r.

80 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42, Fasc. 1, f. 20r–v (Pacelli to Ratti, 16.7.1920): "Io, tuttavia, mi sono limitato a trasmettere, come di dovere, alla S. Sede gli Esposti rimessimi alriguardo, senza entrare in merito, anche perchè sapevo che il sullodato Eminentissimo [i.e. Bertram] aveva già manifestato al S. Padre, per mezzo di persone di sua fiducia recatesi in questi ultimi tempi a Roma, le sue vedute ed i suoi desideri intorno alla delicatissima questione dell'Alta Slesia..."

sent or communicated to him.<sup>81</sup> Additionally, the main protagonists in the conflict kept Pacelli well informed about the novelties in the situation by sending him copies of their letters and memoranda to other participants, like Bertram who sent Pacelli a copy of his letter to the Vatican as well as his circulars to his diocese.<sup>82</sup>

Despite his secondary role in the conflict, Pacelli spent a lot of time following the tricky situation in Upper Silesia. The over 1,000 folios of material regarding this issue in his nunciature archives bear testimony of his workload with the case. The amount of material is, however, not a surprise, since the crises in the territory lasted for years, from the beginning of the events in 1919 until the mid-1920s, when situation was finally settled and the diocesan borders defined.<sup>83</sup>

## Conclusions

The period of Pacelli's mission in Munich and Berlin took place in difficult times. Germany was first at war, which ended dramatically for the country: it lost large territories and certain other territories, like the Saar or the Ruhr, were occupied by allied troops. At the same time economic depression impoverished the country and large parts of its population.

As papal nuncio, Pacelli was involved in a vast spectrum of different kinds of questions. Even though he did not discuss political issues in his final report to the Congregation of the Consistory in 1929, the study of the archives of Pacelli demonstrated that political issues formed a large part of the activity of the nuncio in Bavaria and Germany. During and after the First World War, Pacelli concentrated on the search and aid for prisoners of war as well as the peace negotiations, in which Pope Benedict XV tried to participate. Also, various political issues emerged after the War, in which the papal representative was involved – not least because the old diocesan borders did not correspond with the new borders and the Catholic Church had to update its administration. The re-establishing of ecclesiastical administration in the post-war period was not an easy task due to political conflicts between

---

81 For example, Count Praschma sent Pacelli in August 1920 a report, which Pacelli transmitted to the Secretariat of State. ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42, Fasc. 1, f. 26r (Praschma to Pacelli, 28.8.1920) and f. 32r (Pacelli to Tedeschini 8.9.1920).

82 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42, Fasc. 1, f. 40r (Bertram to Pacelli, 6.10.1920) and ff. 42r–43v (copy of Bertram to Gasparri); Fasc. 2, f. 55r (Bertram to Pacelli, 17.12.1921) and f. 56r (circular letter).

83 ASV, *Arch. Nunz. Berlino* 42.

different nations. It was, however, the task of the nuncio to remain impartial and to listen to both sides. Pacelli apparently succeeded well in this, since the German politicians and Catholics appreciated him greatly. But politics was apparently not among his first interests, as Heinrich Brüning wrote in his memoirs, since despite his twelve years in Germany Pacelli never fully understood the basics of German politics or the special position of the Catholic *Zentrum* party.<sup>84</sup>

The three examples concerning the role of the German nuncio in the difficult situations in which political, national and linguistic aspirations collided, demonstrated clearly that political controversies required a lot of attention of the nuncio and he played different kinds of roles in resolving these issues. Firstly, an important part of Pacelli's work as nuncio was to send to the Roman Curia, at the request of the cardinal secretary of state, various reports with information, which the Holy See needed for making right decisions in difficult situations. Secondly, the nuncio was expected to act as intermediary and to forward letters and reports of German politicians and ecclesiastical authorities to Rome. With the sending of these documents the locals wanted to ensure that their point of view would be heard in the Vatican. The third important role of Pacelli was to give his personal opinions to his superiors. The examples used in this chapter demonstrated that the German nuncio expressed – when asked – his own opinion on the matters and his opinion was clearly appreciated and respected in the Vatican.

Despite the huge workload with political issues, of which the archives of Pacelli provide rich testimony, supervising religious life was considered the most important mission of a papal nuncio. Also, Pacelli was sent to Germany to defend the rights of the Church and Catholics and to supervise the ecclesiastical life in the country. In this role he participated in different conferences, visited Catholic parishes all over the country, discussed and corresponded with thousands of persons and also took care of the core of his mission, the cure of souls of the believers. His final report gives a full picture of this side of his mission, but not of all his other activities in Germany.

---

84 Brüning 1970, 358. Cited in Wolf & Unterburger 2006, 82.

KIRSI SALONEN

## Bibliography

### Unprinted sources

- ARCHIVIO SEGRETO VATICANO, Vatican City** **ASV**  
*Archivio della Nuntiatura in Monaco di Baviera* *Arch. Nunz. Monaco*  
Scatole 307–415  
*Archivio della Nuntiatura in Berlino* *Arch. Nunz. Berlino*  
Scatole 307–415
- SEGRETERIA DI STATO, SEZIONE PER I RAPPORTI CON GLI STATI,  
ARCHIVIO STORICO, Vatican City** **S.RR.SS.**  
*Congregazione degli Affari Ecclesiastici Straordinari* *AA.EE.SS.*  
Germania, IV periodo [6.2.1922–10.2.1939]  
Pos. 511, Fasc. 24  
Stati Ecclesiastici, IV period  
Pos. 305, Fasc. 34

### Archival indexes

- Indice 1096A*  
2003 *Indice 1096A. Archivio della Nuntiatura Apostolica in Monaco, a cura di Kirsi Salonen. Città del Vaticano: Archivio Segreto Vaticano.*
- Indice 1096B*  
2003 *Indice 1096B. Archivio della Nuntiatura Apostolica in Monaco. Prigionieri della prima guerra mondiale, a cura di Kirsi Salonen. Città del Vaticano: Archivio Segreto Vaticano.*
- Indice 1196*  
2003 *Indice 1196. Archivio della Nunziatura Apostolica in Berlino, a cura di Kirsi Salonen. Città del Vaticano: Archivio Segreto Vaticano.*

### Printed sources

- Brüning, Heinrich*  
1970 *Memoiren 1918–1934. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.*
- CIC 1917*  
2001 *The 1917 Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law in English Translation with Extensive Scholarly Apparatus. Ed. by Dr. Edward N. Peters. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.*
- Wolf, Hubert & Unterburger, Klaus* (eds.)  
2006 *Eugenio Pacelli, Die Lage der Kirche in Deutschland 1929. Ed. by Hubert Wolf & Klaus Unterburger. Paderborn: Schöningh.*

#### Internet sources

*Kritische Online-Edition*

[s.a.] Kritische Online-Edition der Nuntiaturberichte von Eugenio Pacelli 1917-1929. <[www.pacelli-edition.de](http://www.pacelli-edition.de)>. Accessed 27.9.2013.

#### Secondary literature

*Baechler, Christian*

2008 Les Alsaciens et le Grand Tournant de 1918. Strasbourg: L'Ami Hebdo/M.E.D.I.A.

*Bergström, Milla*

2015 Pyhä istuin, Puola ja Itä-Galitsian puolalais-ukrainalaiset jännitteet 1921–1931. Diss. Helsinki. Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran toimituksia 230. Helsinki: SKHS.

*Borengässer, Norbert M.*

1995 Schulte, Karl Joseph. – Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon 9. Herzberg: Bautz. Coll. 1118–1123.

*Borutta, Manuel*

2010 Antikatholizismus. Deutschland und Italien im Zeitalter der europäischen Kulturkämpfe. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

*Brechenmacher, Thomas (ed.)*

2007 Das Reichskonkordat 1933. Forschungsstand, Kontroversen, Dokumente. Ed. by Thomas Brechenmacher. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte, Reihe B: Forschungen 109. Paderborn: Schöningh.

*Chenaux, Philippe*

2003 Pie XII. Diplomate et pasteur. Archives de sciences sociales des religions 128. Paris: Cerf.

2012 Eine Deutsche Prägung? Die deutschen Nuntiaturen (München, Berlin) und ihre Bedeutung für Eugenio Pacelli – Eugenio Pacelli als Nuntius in Deutschland. Forschungsperspektiven und Ansätze zu einem internationalen Vergleich. Ed. by Hubert Wolf. Paderborn & München & Wien & Zürich: Schöningh. Pp. 99–109.

*Cornwell, John*

1999 Hitler's Pope. The Secret History of Pius XII. New York: Viking & Penguin Group.

*De Marchi, Giuseppe*

1957 Le Nunziature Apostoliche dal 1800 al 1956. Prefazione di S. E. Mons. Antonio Samoré. Sussidi Eruditi 13. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

## KIRSI SALONEN

### *Fattorini, Emma*

- 1986 Il cattolicesimo politico tedesco. Il partito del Zentrum. Bologna: Il Mulino.  
1992 Germania e Santa Sede: Le nunziature di Pacelli fra la Grande guerra e la Repubblica di Weimar. Bologna: Il Mulino.

### *Fischer, Conan*

- 2003 The Ruhr Crisis, 1923–1924. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

### *Gromada, Thaddeus V.*

- 1979 Slovak Nationalists and Poland during the Interwar Period. – *Jednota Annual Furdek*, Vol. 18. Pp. 241–253.

### *Gross, Michael B.*

- 2004 The War against Catholicism. Liberalism and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Germany. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

### *Hinkel, Sascha*

- 2010 Adolf Kardinal Bertram. Kirchenpolitik im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik. Paderborn: Schöningh.

### *Hinkel, Sascha & Hörnschemeyer, Jörg & Lorenz-Filigrano, Maria Pia & Richter, Elisabeth-Marie & Salonen, Kirsi & Schüler, Barbara & Wolf, Hubert*

- 2012 Die kritische Online-Edition der Nuntiaturberichte Eugenio Pacellis. Präsentation des Projekts. – Eugenio Pacelli als Nuntius in Deutschland. Forschungsperspektiven und Ansätze zu einem internationalen Vergleich. Ed. by Hubert Wolf. Paderborn & München & Wien & Zürich: Schöningh. Pp. 23–45.

### *Howard, Michael*

- 1991 The Franco–Prussian War. The German Invasion of France 1870–1871. New York: Routledge.

### *Höpel, Thomas*

- 2012 Der deutsch-französische Grenzraum. Grenzraum und Nationenbildung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. – *Europäische Geschichte Online*. <<http://ieg-ego.eu/de/threads/crossroads/grenzregionen/thomas-hoepel-der-deutsch-franzoesische-grenzraum>>. Accessed 3.3.2014.

### *Jeannesson, Stanislas*

- 1998 Poincaré, la France et la Ruhr 1922–1924. Histoire d'une occupation. Strasbourg: Presses universitaires de Strasbourg.

### *Kraus, Hans-Christof*

- 2013 Versailles und die Folgen. Außenpolitik zwischen Revisionismus und Verständigung 1919–1933. Berlin: Bebra Verlag.

Eugenio Pacelli and the Role of the Apostolic Nuncio in Germany in 1917–1929 ...

*Levant, Marie*

- 2012 Reconquérir le Reich? Le Vatican et l'Allemagne de Weimar, des nonciatures Pacelli au Reichskonkordat (1919-1934). Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Brest: Université de Bretagne Occidentale.
- 2013 Monseigneur Testa, envoyé special en pays rhénan (1923–1924). – Le gouvernement pontifical sous Pie XI. Ed. by Laura Pettinaroli. Collection de l'École française de Rome 467. Rome: École française de Rome. Pp. 117–136.

*Lins, Joseph*

- 1911 Metz. – The Catholic Encyclopedia 10. New York: Robert Appleton Company. <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/10247a.htm>>. Accessed 27.9.2013.

*Mitchell, Allan*

- 1965 Revolution in Bavaria, 1918–1919. The Eisner Regime and the Soviet Republic. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

*Morsey, Rudolf*

- 1977 Eugenio Pacelli als Nuntius in Deutschland. – Pius XII. Ed. by Herbert Schambeck. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot. Pp. 103–139.

*Pettinaroli, Laura*

- 2010 Les *sessioni* de la congrégation des Affaires ecclésiastiques extraordinaires. Évaluation générale (1814–1938) et remarques sur le cas russe (1906–1923). – Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Italie et Méditerranée. Tome 122, N° 2. Rome: École française de Rome. Pp. 493–537.

*Pollard, John F.*

- 1999 The Unknown Pope. Benedict XV (1914–1929) and the Pursuit of Peace. London & New York: Chapman.

*Regoli, Roberto*

- 2010 Il ruolo della Sacra Congregazione degli Affari Ecclesiastici Straordinari durante il pontificato di Pio XI. – La sollecitudine ecclesiale di Pio XI. Alla luce delle nuove fonti archivistiche. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio. Città del Vaticano, 26–28 febbraio 2009. Ed. by Cosimo Semeraro. Pontificio Comitato di Scienze Storiche. Atti e Documenti 31. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana. Pp. 183–229.
- 2013 Decisioni cardinalizie ed interventi papali. Il caso della Congregazione degli Affari Ecclesiastici Straordinari. – Le gouvernement pontifical sous Pie XI. Pratiques romaines et gestion de l'universel. Ed. by Laura Pettinaroli. Collection de l'École française de Rome 467. Rome: École Française de Rome. Pp. 481–501.

*Salonen, Kirsi*

- 2003 Paavillisten Saksan-lähetystöjen arkistot ja historiantutkimus. – Historiallinen Aikakauskirja (4/2003). Pp. 603–610.

KIRSI SALONEN

*Schulze, Thies*

- 2013 Der Kampf um die Schulen. Das Ringen um die Gestaltung des religiösen Primarschulunterrichtes in Elsass-Lothringen und Südtirol in den 1920er Jahren. – Grenzüberschreitende Religion. Vergleichs- und Kulturtransferstudien zur neuzeitlichen Geschichte. Ed. by Thies Schulze. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Pp. 140–161.

*Sierpowski, Stanisław*

- 1988 Watykan wobec polsko-niemieckich plebiscytów 1919–1921. – Part of an unpublished work *Watykan wobec Europy środkowo-wschodniej po I wojnie światowej*. <<http://www.wbc.poznan.pl/dlibra/docmetadata?id=22655&from=publication>>. Accessed 27.9.2013.

*Wawro, Geoffrey*

- 2003 The Franco–Prussian War. The German Conquest of France 1870–1871. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Wolf, Hubert & Unterburger, Klaus*

- 2006 Einleitung. – Eugenio Pacelli, Die Lage der Kirche in Deutschland 1929. Ed. by Hubert Wolf & Klaus Unterburger. Paderborn: Schöningh. Pp. 13–93.