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CHAPTER I

THE LIBERAL POPE: June 1846–June 1847

As Robert Peel's second ministry was in the last days of its existence, and the Whigs, under Lord Russell were about to regain their former ascendancy, another change of government, perhaps more significant than that in England, was taking place in central Italy, in that strip of land stretching irregularly from the Kingdom of Naples to Ferrara known as the Papal States. Pope Gregory XVI had died June 1, 1846, and the cardinals, giving no more than the specified time to the required funeral rites, proceeded quickly to form a conclave and elect a new Bishop of Rome. The voting commenced June 15. On the afternoon of the following day the white smoke of the burnt ballots announced the election of Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti, Bishop of Imola, who chose to call himself Pius IX, in memory of his friend and benefactor Pius VII.¹

The new Pope had been born May 13, 1792, at Sinagaglia, near the Adriatic sea, in the Marches of the Papal States. He was the second son of Count Jerome Mastai-Gerretti and Catherine Solazzi, a family known to hold "enlightened" or mildly liberal political views, but of no great prominence in the Roman States.

The education of Pius IX had taken place first at Volterra in Tuscany under the Fathers of the Pious Schools. His studies for the priesthood were made at Rome in the Roman Seminary. Sickness caused these studies to be interrupted for a time, but the young Mastai-Ferretti was finally ordained on April 10, 1819, at the age of twenty-six. His first assignment was the chaplaincy at Tata Giovanni, an orphanage in Rome, where he earned a reputation for zeal and generosity. He served on a diplomatic mission to South America, undertaken to smooth out certain difficulties between the recently established Republic of Chile and the Church of Rome. The mission was unsuccessful. On his return to Rome, Father Mastai-Ferretti was appointed as director of the large Saint Michael's hospital in Rome. Impressed with his abilities and virtue, Leo XII named the young director Archbishop of Spoleto, a small diocese in the province of Umbria not far from Rome. At the time of this nomination in 1827, Mastai-Ferretti was only thirty-four years old. In the delicate situation created by the Italian uprisings of 1830-31, he handled himself well, winning the trust and esteem of the revolutionaries by his kindness and practical charity.\(^2\) In 1832 Gregory XVI transferred him to the more difficult post of the Bishopric of Imola in the Romagna, where the revolutionary spirit was both organized and vocal. Nevertheless, Bishop Mastai-Ferretti was able to temper the abuses of the pontifical government and conquer all hearts by his personal charm and goodness, his lack of partisan spirit, and his administrative qualities. He was an outspoken critic of the bad government

\(^2\) Aubert, pp. 14-15.
and the stop-gap measures used to meet the numerous crises arising from the abuses fostered by the system of the pontifical government. He urged upon Rome practical administrative measures to reform abuses and to relieve distress. For his pains, he was made to wait until 1840 before receiving a cardinal's hat, although appointment to the see of Imola was normally regarded as the immediate prelude to elevation to the College of Cardinals. Although Bishop Mastai-Ferretti did not succeed in achieving many reforms in the Romagna, he did restrain by his clemency the worst abuses and won for himself an enormous popularity with the lower classes. Thus, it was that Cardinal Mastai-Ferretti, aged fifty-four, came to the conclave in June, 1846, as one of the principal papabili, despite the fact that he was far less known to the European world than the arch-conservative candidate, Cardinal Lambruschini, or the liberal candidate, Cardinal Gizzi.

Pius IX, at his election, was an ecclesiastic possessed of great personal gifts and charm. His personality, full of kindness and openness of soul, was of a sort to make him a great crowd-pleaser. He had a natural sympathy for the unfortunate, a sympathy abetted by his experiences with the abuses of autocracy. Though he had read much of the current literature of the Italian liberal party, he seems never to have personally rallied to the neo-guelph program set out by Gioberti, or the full program of liberal and constitutional reforms encouraged by D'Azeglio. The apparent liberalism of Pius IX, which took Europe by storm in his first years, may be reduced,

on the one hand, to a liberality of spirit which led him to believe that it were far better to disarm the revolutionary spirit by sweetness than to try and crush it by force, particularly when the prince is also the vicar of Christ, the Prince of Peace, and model of all virtues. In a word, Pius IX wished to forestall the threat of revolution in the Papal States by anticipating and responding to the wishes of the moderate liberals in so far as he was able to do so.\(^4\) On the other hand, there is no doubt that Pius IX was truly sincere in his desires to correct the abuses of the pontifical government and institute reforms, provided always that the reforms in no way compromised or limited that full sovereignty which the Pope considered absolutely necessary to his peculiar status as sovereign of the Papal States and head of the Roman Catholic Church.\(^5\) At the outset of his reign, then, Pius IX undoubtedly hoped to quiet the voices of discontent by a program of administrative reforms carried through with a gentle hand. His formula of personal charity and kindness, popular appeal, and sweet reasonableness had given him success in all his past endeavors, and there is every reason to believe that Pius IX was confident that these qualities would carry him through as ruler of the Papal States. He had laid out for himself in 1845 a program of administrative reforms he considered both useful and necessary.\(^6\) His election to the papacy now provided the chance to carry them through. Brought to completion, these reforms would have made Pius IX the most benevolent of all autocrats, but an autocrat nonetheless.

\(^4\) Aubert, pp. 15, 17, 28.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 16.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 15.
The new Pope had no experience with constitutional or representative forms of government, nor did he see a place for them in the monarchical structure of the Catholic Church or the States of the Church. 7

Before treating the reaction of the British press to the election of Pius IX, we must pause for a moment to see the general standing of the Papal States and their rulers in the eyes of English observers. Summarily, one could say that the British view of the Papal States and all Italy was characterized by ambivalence. At the time of the death of Gregory XVI, the reputation of the pontifical government was extremely low. Mazzini, living as an exile in England, wrote in the Westminster Review, December, 1845, that the popes were "all-powerful for evil, absolutely impotent for good." 8 Charles Dickens made a significant contribution to this general impression with his small work Pictures of Italy (1846), which present some very unflattering portraits of Roman Catholicism, the Pope, the papal government, and the religious orders, especially the Jesuits. 9 These prejudices, nevertheless, did not prevent Englishmen from traveling in Italy. Since the days of the Renaissance, the cultural bonds between England and Italy had always been close. 10 The classical bent of English education for the


upper classes formed a cultural outlook so that in Rome not even the English Protestant gentleman could feel himself a stranger and foreigner. Rome, Naples, and Florence were all part of the Grand Tour. Italy was to the English educated classes a playground, a garden, and a museum. As the same time, Italy represented to the popular English imagination a picture of the supposed evils of the middle ages—superstitious religious practices, popery, and convents full of lazy monks and friars. It was also the headquarters of the hated and feared Jesuits, who still represented for the majority of Englishmen the epitome of the malice and treachery of the human heart.

If Italian culture contained an abiding source of inspiration and interest for the English mind, the political situation did not. Italy had been so long the plaything of the powers of Europe that few Englishmen thought in terms of Italy as a united nation. In fact, it would seem safe to say that, politically speaking, few Englishmen even thought of Italy. So involved had England been since the close of the Napoleonic wars with internal reforms at home and the preservation of peace abroad that sentiment favoring the aspirations of national groups on the Continent was not

widespread in England. Though Italian exiles were living in England, writing and disseminating their liberal and national gospel, they did not evoke any deep response from the English people and press before 1848. The exiles, when they landed in 1830-31, were more of a season's fashion than an object of sympathy. So tired did the British press become in the following years with books and articles on Italian culture, art, and history that in 1846 Bentley's Miscellany wearily observed that every publisher, every critic, and almost every reader was crying: "Italy is a hackneyed subject."

The attitude of the British government to Italy and the Papal States was more businesslike and discerning. Though the Foreign Secretary, Viscount Palmerston, had stated as early as 1832 his conviction that England should support constitutional states as natural allies, he was unwilling, without some great hope of success, to foster the growth of such states at the expense of alienating France or Austria and creating a serious threat to the peace of Europe. In 1846 Palmerston recognized with equanimity

---


11 A thorough treatment of the Italian exiles is had in Margaret C. W. Wicks, The Italian Exiles in London: 1816-1848 (Manchester, 1937). Helpful also is Rudman's work cited above in note 8.

12 "On Travels and Travellers in Italy," Bentley's Miscellany, XX (1846), 244. This journal was a popular monthly of the publishing house of Richard Bentley. Charles Dickens edited it 1837-1839, but by 1847 it was a distinct losing venture with a very limited circulation. It rarely discussed politics as such, but when it did, its views leaned toward a moderate liberalism. Royal A. Gettman, A Victorian Publisher (Cambridge, Eng., 1940), pp. 22-25.
the power monopoly of Austria in Italy. Like many of his countrymen, he also acknowledged that the states directly under Austrian control were the best governed in the Italian Peninsula. The Papal States he thought to be the worst governed, and for that reason a menace to peace, always standing as they were in need of foreign intervention likely to disturb the balance of power and bring on a European crisis.15

Slightly more than a week before the death of Gregory XVI, the Times had printed an editorial detailing what it held to be the two principal political grievances of Italy: corrupt government and foreign domination.16 The worst corruption existed, it said, in the Papal States, where abuses of every kind served as a continual cause of contempt and hatred of the subjects for their sovereign. Piedmont and Tuscany, it went on, gave some slight signs of wanting to become more liberal, but these were mere "faint indications of what the Italian states might readily become under the direction of vigorous and enlightened governments." While recognizing the evil of Austrian hegemony, the Times refused to sympathize with the Italian liberals who complained of this domination, for, it argued, "as long as the Austrian administration is the best, or one of the best, in Italy, the mere passion of political independence will never excite the people to


15 Bell, I, 413. The best study of the problem of Italy in European history during the early years of Pius IX's reign is A. J. P. Taylor, The Italian Problem in European Diplomacy 1847-1849 (Manchester, 1934).
make a serious effort to throw off that form of government." The Times had a supreme confidence in the force and power of good government to raise a country to the level of a prosperous and independent nation. If only the reigning princes in Italy, instead of following the lead of Austria, would show enough vigor and independence to strike out in a new direction with a liberal program and a national policy of their own, the Times felt sure that they need then fear nothing—neither invasion nor insurrection. Italy's natural position vis-a-vis Austria is one of free rivalry, the Times declared, and if this rivalry were directed by able statesmen toward a program of public improvement, the importance of the Italian states would be immeasurably increased abroad, and their security and prosperity augmented at home. Good government, then, embracing certain liberal improvements, was the Times' remedy for Italy's ills. Consequently, from the very outset of the reign of Pius IX, the Times was psychologically set to act as a most sympathetic observer of every reform he would undertake. It also stood prepared to give those reforms an erroneous "liberal" interpretation, which was foreign to the mind of their initiator. The whole reaction of the Times, and of the British press in general, must therefore be seen in the light of this psychological pre-conditioning.

The death of Gregory XVI caused no great stir in England. The English Review, an Anglo-Catholic publication given to violent bursts of No-Popery,
was content to mention his death and the subsequent election of Pius IX without making any comment whatsoever. 18 Almost all other periodicals ignored the event, including the Dublin Review. 19 The Times, on the whole, gave a favorable picture of the late pope. He was, it said, a good, kind, and benevolent man, sincere in his religious principles, and somewhat more tolerant than many of his predecessors. The Times considered him to have been little qualified to uphold the interests and dignity of the papal political situation, but it attributed his failures to his timidity in the face of a clique of reactionary cardinals at Rome. 20 The Times felt, however, that "his reign cannot escape the charge of cruelty in the repression of political offences, and of a most bigoted resistance to the practical improvements of the age." Turning to the spiritual affairs of the Catholic Church, the Times declared that Gregory XVI would always be remembered for the great activity he engendered and for the vigor and decision he displayed in the emergencies which arose about him. Conscientious in his duty, the "safe," and usually on the side of a conservative liberalism. Cf. History of the Times (London, 1939), II, 57-59. Also H. R. Fox Bourne, English Newspapers (London, 1887), II, 164-190.

17Times, May 23, 1846.

18English Review, V (June, 1846), 504. This review was the organ of the Anglo-Catholic party in England and the successor to the British Critic, formerly edited by John Henry Newman. It dealt principally with religious topics and had strong anti-Roman and anti-papal viewpoints. Graham, p. 256.

19The Dublin Review was founded in 1836 by Daniel O'Connell and Nicholas Wiseman. Initiated chiefly to be the voice of Catholicism and to combat the Edinburgh Review, its views were generally quite conservative on political issues. Its articles throughout 1846-1850 show little interest in happenings on the Continent. Cf. Denis Gwynn, "The Dublin Review and the Catholic Press," Dublin Review, CXCVIII (June 1936), 311-321.

20Times, June 9, 1846.
Times concluded, Gregory ruled the Church in "modest dignity."

Looking to the future, the Times saw no more than that "some other obscure monk" would ascend the throne to confront a task of extreme magnitude. Whoever he is, it surmised, he shall probably not be able to maintain himself six months without the aid of the Austrian army. Whether he maintained himself or not did not seem to cause the Times any anxiety. In the days before the conclave, the Times carried periodic reports of outbreaks and movements of unrest in the Papal States. In Rome, crowds were reportedly shouting "No Papal government!" and "Down with the priests!" Since these reports were so much in keeping with the Times' expectations, it made no comment on them except to remark that throughout Italy there was "a storm brewing," if not already in progress. The Times manifestly expected the death of the Pope to throw the Papal States into a state of revolution.

Pius IX was elected on June 16, 1846. The first announcement in the Times came on June 22 and contained no details except that the bishop of Imola was elected as Pius IX. In the following days several biographies taken from the French papers were reprinted in the Times. Most of them contained certain errors of fact which indicated that Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti was a relative unknown in the European world.

21 Times, June 12, 1846.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid., June 15, 1846.
24 Ibid., June 22, 1846.
25 Ibid., June 24 and July 3, 1846.
The Times was swift to comment, though it gave its attention more to the conclave than to the new Pope. It found the election marked by a precipitancy induced by a sense of danger. The cardinals, it said, wanted no prolonged interregnum conducive to civic disturbances, and therefore acted with dispatch to secure their own candidate before the arrival of the French, Belgian, or German cardinals. Because of the swiftness of the conclave and the obscurity of Pius IX, the Times conjectured that the new Pope was a party choice and probably not chosen for his capacity as a reformer. Yet the Times hoped that Pius IX was aware "that things cannot go on as they are." Whereas most popes, it said, are so old at their election that they can always hope that the storm will not break before the end of their reign, the youth of Pius IX deprives him of this security, and "he must make his choice to destroy these abuses or to suffer by them."27

The qualities the Times sought in the new Pope were more negative than positive. He must be neither bold nor corrupt, it said, but a man of discretion and moderation, disposed to withdraw himself from all contentions of civil government and temporal politics as much as possible and to devote his system "to the highest objects of peace on earth and good will towards men."28 The Times might have said as much for a new Archbishop of Canterbury. These general moralizations, together with the silence of the greatest part of the British press, show clearly that very little was hoped for

26 Times, June 23, 1846.
27 Ibid., June 24, 1846.
28 Ibid.
from the newest occupant of the Chair of Peter. The *Annual Register* for 1846 noted that the election had "hardly excited attention in the political world; so much has the temporal power of Papacy been diminished, and its influence upon the affairs of other nations destroyed." 29

Among the governments of Europe, the election of Pius IX was generally received with satisfaction. The Austrian court was happy to have got by Gizzi; the French were pleased not to have gotten Lambruschini; and the new ministry of Russell was satisfied with a Pope who was reported to be no extremist, but a moderate reformer. 30 In Italy, where Pius IX was better known, the moderate liberals rejoiced, for now they had a sympathetic ruler. With the aid of Pius IX, they could hope to obtain reasonable reforms and cut the ground from under the more revolutionary groups which advocated radical social and political changes.

By early July, the image of Pius IX was becoming somewhat clearer in the British press. He was said to possess "political opinions sufficiently liberal to give hope of a change of system, though not violent enough to create alarm from the fear of too rapid a change." 31 The big test posed for the new Pope by the *Times* was the naming of a Secretary of State, 32 which test Pius IX passed with honors to the perfect satisfaction of the *Times* by appointing to that office Cardinal Gizzi, whose reputation for

---

29 *Annual Register* (1846), p. 298.


31 *Times*, July 3, 1846.

32 Ibid.
liberal views was well established. By July 9, 1846, the Times pronounced itself content with the conduct of the new Pope, his choice of ministers, and the prospects for the Papal States. The appointment of Gizzi was particularly gratifying, for it demonstrated, said the Times, that not only was Pius IX determined to improve the conditions of his state, but he also knew how to use the best instruments to secure his goals. From the reports and comments throughout July, 1846, one easily gathers the impression that more was expected from the action of Gizzi than from that of Pius IX.

The Times was anxious to encourage the Pope in the work he had undertaken. The only opposition he had to fear, it told him, came from bigoted reactionaries, interested in maintaining the ancient system. It saw no serious threat from the liberal side; it only hoped that by his reforms Pius IX would frustrate and eventually annihilate "those seditious projects which a portion of the Italian refugees are too apt to entertain." The Times did not want to see "the desperate faction in Italy" challenge the new Pope and drive him back upon those "fatal expedients which have reduced the Government of the Vatican to its present condition." It desired that the good intentions of the Pope be given every chance to operate; it could only regret that England had no resident minister in Rome to second the reform efforts and lend a guiding hand.

Fear of any uprising against the new Pope was soon laid aside, and

33 Times, July 7, 1846.
34 Ibid., July 9, 1846.
35 Ibid.
attention began to focus on the rumored amnesty. Almost from the day of Pius IX's election, talk of an amnesty was current, though it was feared that Austrian influence would considerably restrict the full play of the papal benevolence. The anticipation of a liberal amnesty increased daily, however, with every new act and anecdote disclosing the liberal tendencies and the personal goodness of the Pope.

On July 11, the promised amnesty was placarded on the walls of Rome. With a very few exceptions, it gave freedom to all political prisoners and exiles. The Roman people were jubilant; a wave of high optimism swept through the camp of the Italian liberals. On the evening of July 17, the Times' correspondent reported, there was not a discontented person in all Rome. A parade of 40,000 persons marched in procession to the Quirinal to thank the Pope and receive his blessing.

The amnesty made an equally deep impression on the rest of the world. While the amnesty was an accustomed act of kindness on the accession of a new ruler, and while Lambruschini had helped to draw it up so that even Metternich found its terms satisfactory, nevertheless it was received and widely interpreted as a "liberal" measure. To the Times' correspondent at Rome, the amnesty was but a promise of "vast and beneficial changes" yet to come. A Times editorial stated that the amnesty "has more than fulfilled the hopes which were conceived upon the accession of the new Pontiff."

---

36 Times, June 30, 1846.
37 Ibid., July 29, 1846. Also Berkeley, II, 42, 45.
38 Aubert, p. 16.
39 Times, July 29, 1846.
It was a "prompt, wise, and benevolent act," the first step to good government. Admittedly, said the Times, there are among the persons amnestied some bad citizens, but with the source of discontent removed by Pius IX, they can no longer obtain a following, and hence represent no danger to the papal government. Unless turned away by oppression and abuse, the Times added, the sympathies of mankind will array themselves with the government. Consequently, the happiness of any state in Italy may be "easily, peacefully, and happily upheld... upon the sole condition of an enlightened and conciliatory administration,"40 The Times was evidently confident that it had found the Italian prince who would provide the proof of its convictions.

It is not to be supposed that the Tory editors of Blackwood's Magazine or the Quarterly Review found all these events in the Papal States to their liking, but they withheld all comments, undoubtedly reserving their judgments until the Pope had declared himself with a few more representative acts. Mazzini, writing in the Edinburgh Review, condemned the amnesty because, as he put it, it offered "a premium to perjury" and substituted "the dead letter for the life."41 On the whole, however, the British press either kept silence or expressed great enthusiasm for the act.

Throughout the month of August, 1846, the press had only two things to note concerning Pius IX: his ever-growing popularity and the contemplated reforms.42 After it was reported that Pius had established a commission to

40 Times, August 4, 1846.
41 Cited in Berkeley, II, 48.
study the prospects for several railroad lines and the gas lighting of Rome, rumors of reforms ran riot. Among the rumors printed by the Times were the reform and reduction of the Swiss guards, the diminution of the number of convents, and the taxation of Church revenues. Needless to say, Pius IX envisioned none of these rumored "reforms," but the fact that they were printed without further comment indicates both the enthusiastic tenor of the initial reaction and the length to which the liberals were prepared to see him go. By the end of August the Times was regarding Pius IX as a vigorous reformer sweeping out the corruption and intrigue of the pontifical government.

Reports like these could not fail to evoke an enthusiastic response from both liberals and conservatives alike. Lord Shaftesbury wrote in his diary for September 1, 1846: "A pope called Pius IX has mounted the Roman throne. He is 'like the son of Nimshi' and 'he driveth furiously.' He will soon be the most popular, as he seems to be the most liberal, man of the day." From Italy, the future Cardinal Manning, still an Anglican cleric, wrote to a friend: "It is impossible not to love Pius IX. His is the most English countenance I have seen in Europe." From an Anglican cleric and a Tory, that was high praise indeed.

Throughout the remaining months of 1846 Pius IX continued to gather more and more support in the English press. Punch, which, in September, noticed and seconded the papal plan to grant municipal government to the

---

43 Times, August 4, 1846.
44 Hoffman, Thought, XXIV, 84.
city of Rome, by December was embracing the Pope as "a good fellow."\textsuperscript{46} The Economist was sure that free trade would find a staunch advocate in "the good and great Pius IX, the most enlightened Pontiff that ever reigned."\textsuperscript{47} The various reforms of the Pope were followed rather closely in the pages of the \textit{Times}, which never left off congratulating Italy on having been granted this liberal leader.

There were, however, some segments of the press which took a more restrained view of the new Pope. Lowe's \textit{Edinburgh Magazine} in November, 1846, and January, 1847, carried articles by Mazzini on "The Pope and the Italian Question." Mazzini maintained that though Pius IX was well-intentioned, papal government was essentially anarchic; he warned the world not to place its faith in popes.\textsuperscript{48} The \textit{North British Review} found the course of Pius IX encouraging and stood ready to give him and Gизzi credit for what they accomplished and promised. Still, what enthusiasm it manifested was tempered by its religious conviction that the papal government could not be fitted to modern times. This effort at re-adjustment by Pius IX was therefore regarded by the \textit{North British Review} with suspicion. It could not see in his acts anything but a devious path toward greater despotic power in spiritual matters. With some insight, it raised the question


\textsuperscript{47}The Economist, October 10, 1846, cited by Elie Halévy, \textit{The Victorian Years: 1841-1895}, Trans. E. I. Watkin, Supplementary section by R. B.
of how Pius IX hoped to reconcile his peculiar claim to spiritual sovereignty with liberal institutions. "It is impossible," the writer maintained, "that the same power, which, in spiritual matters, will not hear of councils, of the right of private judgment, of the independence of bishops, will admit in temporal matters, of a Parliament, bear with an opposition, and respect the independent rights of members of the legislature." In the eyes of Pius IX this discussion would have been wholly irrelevant; he had no intention of instituting a constitutional government with a responsible ministry. What is relevant in these remarks of the North British Review is the fact that they reveal a profound ignorance of the mind of the Pope. They show that once the English press accepted Pius IX as a liberal Pope, they were apt to draw their conclusions as to his intentions from their own understanding of "liberal" reforms and "liberal" institutions. Had events in Italy not driven the revolution on, the English might have soon understood their error. As it was, there were only a few who, before April, 1848, ever suspected that Pius IX had not contemplated anything beyond administrative reforms and consultative assemblies in the Roman states.

On November 9, 1846, Pius IX issued his first encyclical, *Qui pluribus*. Composed with the aid of conservative cardinals, it contained an excellent

---
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"Italy," North British Review, VI (November 1846), 170-205. This journal, founded in 1844 and edited by David Welsh, professed non-partisanship in politics and religion, but was openly on the liberal side. Cf. Graham, p. 256.
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synthesis of the doctrinal positions defended by Gregory XVI. It condemned rationalism and all undue freedom of thought. It made those who read it pause and reflect, but perhaps because it was of a purely doctrinal character, or perhaps because it seemed quite out of character with the excitement taking place at Rome, the encyclical went almost unnoticed. Only the English Review, the Anglo-Catholic watchdog, gave it a thorough going-over. Its suspicions of papal trickery were even stronger than those of the North British Review. Pius IX, it said, is following a course likely to render him popular, but none of this furnishes one reason for expecting that he will deviate in the least from the ultramontane pretensions of the Roman see. There has been no change of goal either by the Pope or the Roman church, it continued; Pius IX has simply adopted the Jesuit policy of adaptation to the spirit of the times so that where his predecessors fought the tide of human progress, the present Pope goes with it to dominate and employ it for papal purposes. The English Review saw in Pius IX's friendship for the Jesuits and in his beatification of Margaret Mary Alacoque, but most of all in the encyclical of November 9, the clearest proofs of his intrasigence and opposition to true progress.

Criticism of this kind was by no means characteristic of the general reaction. By January, 1847, the approval of Pius IX by the British press and people had become rather widespread. Fraser's Magazine beheld the Pope standing in "sublime solitude among the successors of St. Peter" in his

51 Aubert, p. 20.

52 "Pope Pius IX: his history and character," English Review, VI (December 1846), 486-492.
efforts to be an enlightened sovereign rather than a spiritual despot. To the Westminster Review, Pius IX was something of a lovable rebel, a Robin Hood, struggling against the old Gregorian-Jesuit party for the welfare of his oppressed people. The liberal-reactionary struggle was seen in terms of light against darkness, of good against evil, much as Sir Walter Scott might have portrayed it in one of his novels, where complexities and subtleties of human politics are resolved on the sublime level of a clear-cut morality. Whether or not the enthusiasm of the British press at this time was anything more than an outpouring of pent-up romantic sentiments and a cheering of novelties is difficult to determine. In view of a concurrent widespread lack of interest in foreign affairs, a depth of real concern should not be too readily assumed, for, as Lord Henry Brougham observed in January, 1847, foreign affairs interested the Lords more than the Commons, and the Commons more than the rest of the country. And the Lords, judging from their debates, were showing no extraordinary solicitude for happenings on the Continent.

At Rome, early in 1847, a difficult situation was emerging for the papal government. The political clubs, controlled by the more ardent liberals, had won the control of the crowds and were using them with telling force to put pressure on Pius IX. They cajoled and coaxed him, playing upon

---

53 Fraser's Magazine, XXXV (January 1847), 13. Hereafter this journal will be cited simply as Fraser's. Edited by William Maguire, a former editor of Blackwood's Magazine, this popular monthly supported Disraeli and a progressive Toryism. Among its contributors were S. T. Coleridge, J. E. Mill, Carlyle, and Thackeray. Cf. Miriam M. H. Thrall, Rebellious Fraser's (New York, 1934).
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the Pope's sensitive nature with disciplined bursts of cheers or prolonged silence. They proposed to drive him onward towards their own goals, propelling him by their control of the public response. The people were made to appear as not too difficult to satisfy, yet every reform was received as the prelude to another still more extreme. No one was given a chance to doubt that Pius IX was not with the crowds; nor were the crowds, on their side, allowed to believe that there were rational limits set by Pius IX beyond which he could not and would not go. Hence, the liberals were creating a false situation in which any attempt by the Pope to halt the reform at a predetermined point short of constitutional government would appear to the world as a reactionary act.

The English press, for its part, noticed the many processions and illuminations at Rome with sincere satisfaction. They were thought to be spontaneous demonstrations of gratitude manifesting the immense rapport between sovereign and subjects. The English particularly liked the "orderliness" of the demonstrations. But if the British press mistook the nature of these parades and processions, Pius IX, at any rate, did not. He took the opportunity of a sermon at the church of St. Andrea della Valle on the evening of January 13 to ask the people to abstain from further scenes of enthusiasm and set to work at revitalizing their own moral lives. It

55Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd series, LXXXIX, 44.
56Berkeley, II, 98, 102-103.
57Times, January 16, 1847.
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was a mild protest, and perhaps for that reason the British press missed the point. The London Daily News praised the moral fervor of the sermon and considered it a gesture of gratitude by the Pope in a heart-to-heart chat with his people.59

In February, 1847, Punch printed a piece of light verse entitled "A Health to the Pope." In three eight line stanzas, Punch exhibited more unrestrained and unguarded enthusiasm for Pius IX than could be found anywhere in Europe. The second and third stanzas were particularly effusive:

For right feeling, with masculine wisdom combined
An intense admiration we own,
Whomsoever they distinguish, indeed, never mind,
If they grace the Pontifical throne.
He who puts down abuses and pushes reforms
In the danger of poison and knife,
Like a rare gallant fellow, our sympathy warms,
And we wish him success and long life!

One, and only one Briton has e'er had the luck
To be raised to the Fisherman's see;
But Pope Pius displays such decision and pluck,
One might think that a Briton was he.
Here's his Holiness' very good health, then, once more,
The tiara long rest on his pate!
And may Pius the Ninth, ere his Popedom is o'er
Earn the title of Pius the Great.60

Indeed, the general strain of the English press was beginning to run along this line adopted by Punch. From February to June, 1847, with the exception of a slight setback in March, Pius IX found nothing but an increasing

59 Report of the Daily News reprinted in the London Guardian, February 3, 1847. The Daily News was founded in 1846 as the Radical spokesman in the daily press. The enterprise was not an immediate success. Charles Dickens was its first editor, but only for a few months. He was rapidly followed by John Forster and Eyre Evans Crowe, who held the editor's chair 1847-1852. Cf. James Grant, The Newspaper Press (London, 1871), II, 83; also Bourne, II, 150; and Maccoby, pp. 420-421.

60 Punch, XII (February 20, 1847), 84.
popularity in England. The London Morning Chronicle, a Whig paper, called him "the most enlightened sovereign of the age." Letters from Rome printed in the English press gave him nothing but unbounded praise. Even Dickens, in his new work, Facts and Figures from Italy (1847), could not restrain an expression of hope and confidence in Pio Nono.

Papal measures of reform and relief were applauded without reserve. On March 23 the Times carried an editorial summarizing its whole attitude toward Pius IX. It beheld him as an "enlightened, clement, and patriotic ruler, uniting all classes of the population in the bonds of social order by the respect they entertain for his personal virtues, and the hopes they have conceived of his public administration....The support to be given by this country to any Pontiff is circumscribed within narrow limits; but nothing, save the fiercest intolerance and the most vulgar prejudice, can deny him the respect and sympathy due to an honest prince and a worthy man." The editorial manifested considerable concern lest Austria use agents provocateurs in the Papal States to provoke disturbances calling for her intervention. To counter this "pernicious" Austrian influence, the Times again urged the government to take the cause of the Pope under its wing and

---
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establish regular diplomatic relations with the Court of Rome so that the "beneficial" guidance of England might be used to safeguard "the great public interests in that quarter."64

The one reverse suffered by Pius IX in the English press during this period came on the occasion of his issuing a press law on March 15, 1847. A week previous to that date the Daily News had treated English readers to a review of the "free press" in Rome and the "bold and enlightened views" of the Roman political writers. The liberal journals were singled out for special commendation while the Diario de Roma, considered to be the organ of the pontifical government, was described as "a goose waddling among swans."65 The restrictions of the Press Law in Rome were not severe, however, and apparently the British press later came to see that they placed no serious check to "liberal progress." Nonetheless, the initial reaction to the press law was one of acute vexation. It means a "rigid censorship," cried the Daily News, and the London Guardian observed that the Pope "has ruined his character with our Liberal contemporaries by laying some pretty stringent restrictions on the liberty of the press. Had he, like Gargantua, swallowed six editors in a salad, our confraternity could hardly have uttered a more piercing outcry."66 Even so, the Guardian felt itself inclined to sympathize with Pius IX in his dealings with the Roman liberals. If the Press Law helped him carry his program of reform free from the

64 Times, March 23, 1847.
66 Guardian, March 31, 1847. For details of the Press Law,
attacks of revolutionaries, then the Guardian did not object.

This momentary loss of popularity was rapidly restored in the following months as Pius IX went ahead with reforming the papal government. He was beginning to feel the pressure of the political clubs. To meet the demand for a greater participation of laymen in the government, the Pope proposed to establish a Consulta, or Consultative Assembly of the Papal States. On April 19, 1847, Cardinal Gizzi issued a circular to his delegates in the provinces informing of the plan to summon to Rome one member of each province so that the deputies, as a body, might offer their advice and counsel to the government. A huge, well-planned demonstration of gratitude took place at Rome on April 22.67

Gizzi's circular was couched in vague terms which could give hopes of some future form of representative government, but if one takes the trouble to read it closely, he sees that it nowhere bows to anything Pius did not wish to grant.68 In speaking of the amelioration of public affairs, "always, however, within those proper limits" fixed by the Pope, the language of the circular was paternal, not liberal. If the British press had been more aware of the on-going struggle hidden beneath the subtleties of language engaged in by both Pope and liberals, they might better have understood the meaning of "those proper limits" spoken of by Gizzi. At the time, however, the words made no significant impression on the press in


67 Berkeley, II, 66-68.

68 The text of the circular was printed in the Times, May 7, 1847.
in England, and it was only in the following year that their meaning became clear.

Throughout May and June, 1847, the papal government was under pressure to grant to the towns a civic guard for the quelling of disturbances. In some places, the revolutionists created disorders to force law-abiding citizens to join in the cry, but most often the request for the civic guard came from the moderate liberals who wished to guard against both Austrian and revolutionary agitation. Pius IX at first favored the creation of a civic guard, evidently thinking that if it sprang from his initiative, he might better control it. Agitation in Rome and in the provinces continued, and in June, 1847, the Pope granted permission for the formation of a civic guard. 69

Members of the papal government were becoming decidedly uneasy as they watched Pius IX take the lead in these various reforms and concessions. Even Cardinal Gizzi, formerly regarded as the most liberal member of the Sacred College, was doubting the wisdom of granting a Consulta and a civic guard as means of satisfying popular demands and trying to call a halt to developments along this path. Pius, too, must have looked with some apprehension upon what he was doing, for on June 22 Cardinal Gizzi issued, undoubtedly with the approval of the Pope, a formal notification to the people of the Papal States, proclaiming Pius' readiness to continue administrative reforms and warning the liberals that there were limits as to what they might expect along constitutional lines. The circular also

warned that the reforms must not be understood or interpreted as an indication of papal hostility towards Austria. The Times, during May and June, 1847, printed news of Rome rather infrequently. It was one of the few observers, however, which did note a split in the Italian liberal party between the moderates, who rallied to the side of the government, and the Esaltati, or the more ardent liberals, who were intent on driving Pius on to establish constitutional government and to further national independence by a war against Austria. The Times incorrectly interpreted this split as a significant victory for the forces of law and order, and as a sure guarantee that Austrian intervention would no longer be necessary. The split, in fact, did not result in any significant advance in the strength of the government, whereas it solidify the strength of the advanced liberals by removing from their group elements of moderation and compromise.

All in all, the first year of Pius IX's reign may be called his "honeymoon" with the British press. From almost every journal which chose to express itself he met with encouragement and support. The church-affiliated reviews regarded his moves with some suspicion, but the majority

70 Berkeley, II, 70, 195.
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opinion was well in his favor. It is significant that the Tory organs, the Quarterly Review and Blackwood's, maintained a discreet silence.

It is also important to note that what Pius IX had won by his reforms was largely a personal popularity. The affection and esteem for him expressed by the British press by no means extended to the pontifical government or to the papacy as such. Expressions of No-Popery and anti-papal sentiment were mitigated in some quarters, but never entirely suppressed. The popularity of Pius IX really did very little to make English writers modify their notions of Catholicism, its dogmas and its practices. As was revealed in the following months, the Pope's popularity did encourage a greater toleration for Catholics, at least in the press, but it is extremely difficult to assess the depth of that effect. One can only say that the first year was a year of good feeling, a year marked by a growing readiness of the British press to give every move of Pius IX a favorable and liberal interpretation.

---

CHAPTER II

PIO NONO: THE NATIONAL SAVIOR: July 1847-April 1848

At Rome, the reforms of Pius IX caused the more radical liberals to grow bolder. They had obtained from Pius a press law, a civic guard, and the promise of a Consulta. With their control of the political clubs, the press, and street agitation, they now felt less need of caution and began an open attack on the conservative pro-Austrian party in the pontifical government. The strength of the moderate liberal party dissolved as the issue of Italian independence gradually placed a no-man's land between the disputing conservative and radical liberal factions. Gizzi's protest in June and his resignation early in July were the first serious signs of the dissolution of moderate influence.

Metternich was aware of the growth of the revolutionary and nationalist party in Rome, and furthermore, he had not too high an opinion of the Pope's ability to handle the situation. Having carefully watched the events happening at Rome since the election of Pius IX, Metternich believed that the Pope's lack of prudence must soon cause him to draw back from his course of reform and call for help to preserve his temporal authority. Austria was prepared to intervene whenever the call came. Metternich was also aware of Pius' personal dislike of Austrian domination in the peninsula.

1 Taylor, p. 27. Also Berkeley, II, 180-182.
and for that reason he had held off from any threatening moves toward the Italian liberal party. When Austria finally did take action against the liberal movement in the Papal States, the initiative came from Radetsky, the veteran military commander of the Austrian forces in Lombardy, to offset any possible anti-Austrian uprisings in the Romagna area.

On July 17, 1847, the anniversary of the amnesty, Austrian troops marched into the Romagna and occupied the citadel of Ferrara. Radetsky acted within the provisions of the Treaty of Vienna, but the menacing intent of the action was obvious. The act inflamed liberal opinion at Rome, where, only two days previously, Ciceruacchio, a popular liberal agitator, had discovered a "plot" by the Gregorian-Austrian-Jesuit-party to organize a public tragedy inviting Austrian intervention. The liberals acted quickly. They armed the civic guard with the permission of the Pope and placed it in control of liberal officers. Pius IX, acting throughout these days without a Secretary of State, had been outmaneuvered, but the significance of the liberal victory went unrecognized in the furor stirred up by the occupation of Ferrara.

Pius IX reacted swiftly and with resentment to the Austrian move. He

---


3 Angelo Brunetti, a wine-carter and son of a blacksmith, was one of the most effective mob leaders in Rome. He was a radical liberal and a supporter of Mazzini. The name Ciceruacchio was attached to him while still a child because of his rotundity. Berkeley, II, 110-112.
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was not devoid of Italian patriotism, nor was he unconscious of, or lacking in, sympathy with the legitimate national aspirations of his people. Not wishing to see these aspirations become the monopoly of the radical element, he was prepared to pursue the goal of Italian independence as far as the action was compatible with his role as head of the universal Church. He was prepared to defend his states against any Austrian encroachment or domination; he was not prepared to undertake an offensive war to drive the Austrians out of Italy. He was no Julius II shouting "fuori i barbari," but his vigorous defense of his prerogatives led to the erroneous, though understandable, conclusion by the rest of Europe that he was standing as the leader of Italian nationalism.

Gizzi's Notificazione of June 22, 1847, caused the British press a moment of consternation, but did not shake it from its conviction that all was going well in Italy. The Guardian declared itself "a little puzzled," while the Times remarked that the circular had created a most deplorable impression on the Roman people. Yet a few days later, a Times editorial made it clear that it was ignorant of the true state of Roman politics. The Times declared: "The gradual and temperate progress of liberal opinions and political reformation amongst the people and some of the governments of Italy, has justly been regarded as one of the most hopeful and pleasing events of our time....Not an instance has occurred of an abuse, or so much as an act of impatience." It went on to comment that the undertaking of a

6Aubert, p. 18. Also Hales, Revolution and Papacy, p. 132.

7Guardian, July 17, 1847; Times, July 7, 1847.
systematic gradual reform had been sufficient to establish close relations between the subjects and the sovereigns. Expectation of a continuance of that reform, it maintained, is the surest guarantee of the existing peace and the future progress of the country. The only substantial threat to moderate reform and progress came from Austria, said the Times, and it called upon all Europe to lend their support to the Italian states. "If they yield, it is because they are defeated; if they are defeated, it is because they are abandoned." 8

The correspondent of the Daily News was fairly overjoyed at the granting of the civic guard, for, once arms are in the hands of the Romans, he said, "adieu, a long adieu, to the hope of every undoing what Pius has done." Gizzi has talked of resigning, the writer continued, but that is no longer of any consequence, because reaction is no longer possible. 9 Such was the view of a newspaper wholly in sympathy with the aims and goals of the Italian liberals. If other segments of the press were disquieted by this interpretation, they did not take the trouble to express themselves.

News of the conspiracy and the occupation of Ferrara took a week to reach England. Most of the printed accounts of the conspiracy had a decidedly anti-Austrian tone. Some French papers treated the affair as a hoax, engineered by the Roman liberals to induce the government to arm the civic guard. 10 The Times accepted the authenticity of the plot, 11 and

8 Times, July 13, 1847.
10 Times, July 28, 1847.
11 Ibid., August 5, 1847.
printed a translation of The Bulletin of the Events Which Have Lately Occurred at Rome, a pamphlet published at Siena. From internal evidence, one could judge that the work was a piece of liberal propaganda intended for public, and particularly foreign consumption. In extravagant language, the author stressed the imminent danger to Rome, the depth and breadth of the conspiracy, the swift and decisive action of the people, the Pope, and the civic guard, the maintenance of public order and love for the process of law in the face of great provocation, and lastly, the people's devotion to the Pope. "The retrograde party is now fairly annihilated," the pamphlet concluded, "and we may confidently look forward to a new, splendid, and solidly organized Government." The Times was ill-inclined to quarrel with that conclusion; it fitted in perfectly with its own expressed views and hopes.

The Guardian took a more cautious view of the conspiracy. It was reluctant to credit the story of the plot because of the air of melodrama and extravagance surrounding the reports, and yet it hesitated to deny the story out of hand, for the Austrian occupation of Ferrara seemed to indicate that something had been in the wind. But whether there was a plot or not, the Guardian was sure that the real facts of the case had merely served as a substratum for enormous and mischievous lying" on the part of the liberals. From this point on, the Guardian maintained a consistently skeptical attitude wherever the activities of the Roman liberals were

12 Times, August 13, 1847.

13 Guardian, August 4, 1847.
concerned. The Daily News, on the contrary, spread the story of the plot, giving a glowing report of the liberals and a very black picture of the reactionaries. 14

If the conspiracy at Rome seemed too confusing and melodramatic to engage the full sympathies of the British press, the Austrian occupation of Ferrara was not. The facts stood out clearly—the liberal Pope was being threatened by a major reactionary power opposed to the reforms and ameliorations undertaken for the welfare of his people. The Pope was manifestly the underdog, and as the case stood, he had already won in the preceding year the support and enthusiasm of England. Thus when Austria made its move, the course of public opinion suffered no complications. The Pope was right; the Austrians were wrong. The majority reaction in England was that simple, a fact which disturbed Metternich and caused him to write a letter to Wellington, complaining of English public opinion.15

In the months from August, 1847, to April, 1848, the popularity of Pius IX in Italy and among the liberals of Europe knew no bounds. He was the National Savior and the Champion of Italy. Every act the Pope took to defend his state had an air of drama about it, or at least the stories and reports portrayed it that way. When the Austrians withdrew their forces from Ferrara in December, 1847, Pius IX's reputation was pushed still higher. Mazzini's Open Letter to the Pope in September, 1847, encouraging him to undertake the unification of Italy, contained an implicit recognition of the fact that, in the eyes of Europe, Pius IX was the leader of the

14 Daily News reprinted in Guardian, August 18, 1847.
liberal movement in Italy. 16

The British press, likewise, did not stand unimpressed by the acts of
the Pope and the constant reports of his popularity all over Italy. The
natural sympathy which could have been expected to appear for Pius IX, con­
sidering the early enthusiasm for him and the current anti-Austrian bias,
was further heightened by the fact that a great many of the reports on
Italian affairs printed in the English papers were taken from the Italian
liberal journals, as the Contemporaneo and the Italia (Rome), the Felsineo
(Bologna), and the Alba (Florence). By papers such as these England was
told that "Austria is now in the presence of a nation united, compact,
enthusiastic beyond description, ready to rise like one man to defend its
independence, and adoring its Sovereign in whom it places every confidence,
and who relies on his people." 17 Moreover, throughout 1847 and 1848,
Italian liberals had committees of correspondence conducting letter-writing
campaigns to all the major newspapers and journals in Europe, e.g. the
Times. 18

The Irish famine and the problems to which it gave birth caused England
to turn its attention principally to home affairs during the fall of 1847.
Parliament found time to discuss little else. Interest in foreign affairs

15 Taylor, p. 30.
17 Times, August 30, 1847, reprinting a report from Italia (Rome).
18 Berkeley, II, 148.
lagged noticeably. The continuing response to Pius IX and the fortunes of the Italian states must be seen against that background.

Palmerston, however, was not idle at the Foreign Office. He took a strong line with Austria over the Ferrara episode and, in a letter to Metternich, defended Pius IX's policy of reform. It was partially through Palmerston's efforts that Metternich agreed to the withdrawal of Austrian forces in December, 1847.

Personally, Palmerston was sincerely concerned about the Pope. The constant aim of his diplomacy was the peace of Europe and the balance of power. Italy constituted a threat to both these objectives inasmuch as its weakness invited foreign intervention either by Austria or France or both. Intervention would result in a disturbance of the balance of power and could lead to a collision between the two great powers, involving the Continent in a European war. Italy, Palmerston believed, was the weak spot of Europe, and the Papal States the weak spot of Italy. Hence he wished to take advantage of the liberal inclinations of Pius IX to reduce the threat of any uprisings giving cause for intervention. His approach to the Italian problem, whatever his own prejudices or bias, was somewhat dispassionate and empirical, at least in this period. Palmerston was prepared to support whatever arrangement secured a stable peace in Europe together with a reasonable balance of power. When it came to concrete cases, he was far more devoted to the interests of Britain and rational principles of diplomacy than to an as yet uncertain force like Italian nationalism.

19 Berkeley, II, 228.
Pius IX, on his side, understood the value of English support in his conflict with Austria. In the summer of 1847 he asked Bishop Nicholas Wiseman to approach the British government on the subject of a British minister at Rome. Wiseman communicated this message to Palmerston in September. The Foreign Office responded quickly. Thus was born the mission of Lord Minto, who, from October, 1847, to February, 1848, journeyed through the Italian states, giving advice and exposing, perhaps too enthusiastically at times, the views of the British government. The actions of Palmerston and the favorable reaction of the British press caused the newspapers of Rome to report early in September that England was supporting the policies of Pius IX. The Times, considering itself the spokesman of the "enlightened and thoughtful statesmen of England," thoroughly approved and smiled on these reports.

The Guardian, during all of 1847, maintained a constant respect and enthusiasm for Pius IX as the only solid and stabilizing moderate influence

---
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22 For a good treatment of the Minto mission, v. Berkeley, II, Appendix B, 344-351. Several times Lord Minto was recorded as shouting to the crowds from balconies, "Viva l'Indipendenza Italiana," to which the crowds eagerly replied, "Viva l'Italia." Evelyn Ashely, The Life of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston, 1846-1865, (London, 1875), I, 36. Lord Minto, in the House of Lords, May 14, 1849, denied that he ever dropped a word which would encourage the advocates of Italian unity or "of any of that sort of nonsense." Quoted in the Quarterly Review, LXXXV (June 1849), 242.
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in the Italian peninsula. If only the educated classes of the Romagna had enough sense, the Guardian wrote, they would see that "the national greatness to which they aspire may be best attained by allowing Pius IX to pursue quietly the course of moderate and judicious reform in which he has embarked."\textsuperscript{24} The Guardian also urged the other states of Italy to follow the Pope as their "representative, champion and leader."\textsuperscript{25} Yet the Guardian was not unaware of the problem facing the temporal sovereignty of the papacy if Pius IX were successful in opposing Austria and uniting Italy. Should he succeed in giving Italy organization and strength sufficient to enable her to stand independent among the powers of Europe, a virtual separation of his powers would become "a matter of necessity."\textsuperscript{26} This separation of powers in the Papal States was foreseen by the Guardian as a distinct possibility following upon the course of events then taking place. Nevertheless, it did not, for that reason, see in the loss of the temporal power a decrease in the power of the papacy, but it rather anticipated its increase.\textsuperscript{27}

Throughout September and October, 1847, the Ferrara episode continued to make news. The correspondent of the Morning Chronicle wrote from Italy that the people were in a "perfect frenzy" in their enthusiasm for Pio Nono.\textsuperscript{28} It was reported that the tricolor was surmounted everywhere by the

\textsuperscript{24} Guardian, September 22, 1847.
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papal gold and white "as if the people would declare, 'Italy--one and indivisible--thanks to the benign influence of Pius IX.'" 29

The mission of Monsignor Corboli-Bussi, 30 sent by Pius IX to Tuscany and Piedmont for the purpose of setting up a customs union, was interpreted by both the English and French press as a further move toward the eventual expulsion of Austria from Italy. 31 The mission also became the subject of rumors about a projected military alliance between the Papal States and Piedmont. 32 The British press and government were all in favor of the customs union, which they compared to the German Zollverein, but they did not look favorably or sympathetically upon an anti-Austrian military league. 33 This reaction was completely in accord with the previous tendencies to support peace, order, and reform as the only true instruments of Italian progress.

---

28 London Morning Chronicle, September 8, 1847, reprinted in the Guardian, September 22, 1847. The Morning Chronicle, a daily newspaper, was before 1847 a Whig journal and the voice of Palmerston in the press. After 1847, it supported a progressive Toryism, and Palmerston transferred his favors to the London Globe. Bourne, II, 152-156.

29 Times, September 16, 1847.

30 Monsignor Corboli-Bussi, born 1813, ordained 1840, was a young priest of known liberal convictions. Appointed to numerous ecclesiastical positions under Gregory XVI and Pius IX, he was for a while, in 1846, acting Secretary of State. In 1847 he was Secretary for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. Corboli-Bussi was one of Pius IX's most trusted advisers throughout this period and was given a number of difficult missions to carry out. Berkeley, II, 36.
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In October Pius IX granted a municipal government to the city of Rome and issued a motu proprio setting the opening date for the Consulta on November 15. All over Italy crowds paraded in the streets in demonstrations of approval. At Rome, banquets became the fashion, just as they did some months later at Paris, and for similar reasons—to apply pressure to the government. The Daily News, the Morning Chronicle, the London Guardian, and the Times had nothing but praise for these latest steps of reform. The Edinburgh Review spoke out on the Pope for the first time, but its admiration was as fervent as that of the Times or Punch. There is again a chance for Italy, it said. "Contrary to all reasonable expectation, Providence has at length raised up a reforming Pope;...a ruler, resolute as Luther, yet gentler than Melancthon." From a leading journal in Protestant England, that was no mean compliment. The writer stood in happy amazement at how Pius IX had rallied his people to his side. Wherever the Pope appears, the author lyricized, "gratior it dies, et soles melius nitent." Supreme optimism was the article's keynote. The Edinburgh Review, like the Times, placed its full confidence in the moderate liberal party in Italy, of which Pius IX was thought to be the perfect example. The uncritical

34Berkeley, II, 320. The use of banquets for the application of pressure to the papal government was in practice as early as November, 1846. Ibid., pp. 85-86.

35"The Papal States--Pius IX," Edinburgh Review, LXXXVI (October 1847), 260-263. This journal was the outstanding liberal review of the time. The only other periodical in its class was the conservative Quarterly Review. The editor of the Edinburgh Review during this period was William Empson. Graham, pp. 244-248.

36Roughly: "The day becomes more lovely, and the sun shines brighter."
enthusiasm of the writer led him to judge that Pius IX was the most secure sovereign in all Europe. He wrote:

That throne, which tottered under his feet, when he ascended it, is now the firmest in Europe. The religious generation in the populace is most remarkable. We see them influenced by the great example of virtue and self-denial, presented to them by the Pontiff....Pius IX, who is ever to be found where there is a question of an evil to be banished, and a good to be attained, represents the moral principle in its most heavenly form, on the Pontifical throne; and by his means we look for its entire restoration.37

The "self-denial" of Pius IX and the "entire restoration" of the papacy spoken of by the writer must be understood to refer to the current conviction that Pius IX was intent not only on the reformation of moral and political abuses in the Papal States, but also on the elevation of his dominion to the level of a constitutional state.

One measure taken by Pius IX in October, 1847, did cause considerable annoyance in England, but his personal popularity suffered even less than it did on the occasion of the Press Law in March. Parliament had proposed the establishment of non-sectarian colleges, "the Queen's colleges," at Dublin, Cork, and Belfast to provide for the education and betterment of Irish youths.38 The Irish Catholic clergy strongly opposed these 'godless' schools, and in October, 1847, a rescript came from Rome declaring them dangerous to faith and morals. It forbade Irish prelates to cooperate in their establishment. This rejection of the Queen's colleges by the Roman Pontiff seriously disturbed Palmerston, who wanted Rome to show a little...
more consideration toward England in return for its support. 39 The Times was deeply offended by the condemnation of what it considered a considerable piece of tolerance and concern for the moral improvement of the Irish people. It did not attribute the condemnation of the colleges to Pius IX, however, but to the combined efforts of the Irish hierarchy and reactionary churchmen at Rome. It hoped that the Pope would be warned of the English temper and be better advised in the future. "Neither the statesmen nor the people of this country," it concluded, "will endure with patience pretensions which fall little short of aggression on our public policy and interference in our political affairs." 40

Punch, usually the Lord-Protector of No-Popery and of Guy Fawkes Day celebrations, took a rather easy attitude and definitely mitigated its anti-papal theme in November, 1847. The move was characteristic of the liberal reaction in England. The conservative journals, on the other hand, were just beginning to speak out and assess the accomplishments of Pius IX. They felt rather strongly about the wave of liberalism sweeping over Italy and other parts of Europe and were of one opinion that the entire movement was heading for a tremendous downfall. Many of them were convinced, like the novelist Charles Lever, that the reform party in Italy were "great blackguards...who only look for a new constitution as an occasion for general pillage." 41 Though the members of the press were restricted to less

39 Ashley, I, 37-40.

40 Times, November 9, 1847. For other criticisms in the British press, v. Bentley's Miscellany, XXIV (1848), 306; Fraser's, XXXVI (December 1847), 746-747; and Quarterly Review, LXXXII (December 1847), 253.
vulgar language, they undoubtedly agreed with Lever in judging that the Pope was "an ass to think that moderate concessions and reasonable privileges will content a mob."42 Pius IX, Lever wrote from Italy, was an ardent, simple-minded, and well-intentioned man, but no more. The conservative journals rapidly fell in with this viewpoint.

The Quarterly Review paid its respects to "the amiable and accomplished Pius IX," but it held a heart full of fears and woes for his future. It considered him inexperienced and possessed of a misconception of his position as ruler of the patrimony of Saint Peter and head of the Catholic Church. His 'wrong' notions it attributed to his "having mixed with Radicals in a revolutionized colony" during his early priesthood.43 Unlike the majority of the British press, the Quarterly Review was one of the rare voices in this early period which perceived that Pius IX was not willing to go beyond the administrative reforms urged by the Memorandum of 1831, a program of moderate reform urged upon Gregory XVI by the Catholic powers of Europe after they had quelled the uprisings in the Papal States. The June 22, 1847, circular of Gizzi was correctly understood by the Quarterly Review as a protest against the pressure of the liberals. The writer

---

41 Edmund Downey, Charles Lever: His Life in His Letters (London, 1906), I, 265. Lever was a popular novelist of Protestant Irish descent with pronounced Tory convictions. Travelling in Italy during the fall of 1847, he wrote quite critically of Pius IX, the reform party, and of the general enthusiasm evidenced for them in the English press.

42 Ibid., pp. 265, 268-269.

43 Quarterly Review, LXXXI (September 1847), 452-453. The Quarterly Review was the leading conservative journal of the first half of the nineteenth century in England. It had the best writers and contributors of the day. The editor at this time was John Gibson Lockhart. Politically, the
calculated that the Pope's current position was one of isolation, somewhere between the reactionary and ardent liberal factions. Pius IX, he said, had arrived at a point where he can neither retreat nor persist in his course "without great danger to far more than the initiator." For that reason, the writer concluded, Europe may expect to hear of many vacillations, plots, and reactions. Here the Quarterly Review was showing considerably more insight than its great rival from Edinburgh.

The English Review, which a year before had stated that Pius IX was absolutely not the liberal he seemed to be, now began to have its doubts. The one consistent element it carried from its former interpretation was its opinion that, in the complicated course of events, Pius IX "never for a moment lost sight of the one great and unbending purpose of the flexible policy of the Roman court—the restoration of papal supremacy." Under the force of this conviction, the English Review now suspected that, to attain his purposes, Pius IX had seriously conceived the bold plan of discarding the support of the ancien régime and of enlisting the democratic tendencies of the age in the service of spiritual despotism. To the English Review, this plan was quite "apparent." Thus it interpreted the efforts of

review was staunchly Tory and displayed a decided mistrust of democracy and republicanism. Graham, pp. 244-248.

\[44\] Ibid.
\[45\] Ibid.
\[46\] Ibid.
\[48\] Ibid., p. 248.
Pius IX to reform the papal administration, to tighten up clerical and monastic discipline, and to enforce a more select choice of prelates for diocesan posts as a vigorous attempt to rejuvenate and reorganize the energies of the Catholic Church preparatory to heading up the democratic movement in the nineteenth century. This interpretation can only be said to be the result of Anglo-Catholic suspicions run riot. In trying to out-guess the Pope, the English Review outsmarted itself.

Another Tory periodical, Fraser's Magazine, declared that it could not cast off its suspicions of Pius IX to share the feelings of sympathy for him held by the majority of Englishmen. Like the English Review, it was unable to conceive of a Pope acting with any other view but the advancement of the interests of the Catholic Church. Consequently it expressed, in hard language, conclusions similar to those of the English Review.

We do not believe that the Pope cares one straw about the liberties of his subjects, or has the slightest love of constitutional government for its own sake. He is a shrewd man, however, and therefore sees that any further alliance between popery in religion and absolutism in civil government must lead to the weakening of the former; and on this account—not because he is actuated by the honest desire of benefiting human society—he has taken liberalism all the world over under his wing. This it is which renders him a liberal Pope. He perceived that impatience under authority, and an eager desire to manage their own affairs, are uppermost in the minds of the masses, and, throwing his Church forward as the leader in the movement, he hopes to secure for it a continued dominion over their consciences.

---

49 Ibid., pp. 250-251.
50 "What Will the Government Do?" Fraser's, XXXVI (December 1847), 743-750.
51 Ibid., p. 746.
Fraser's could not, then, but feel uneasy as it watched the growing rapprochement between the British government and the papacy. Its whole anxiety was wrapped up in the question: "Can we trust this man?"\textsuperscript{52}

The ever increasing popularity of Pius IX in England can almost be judged by the equally increasing animosity towards the Pope by the English Review, whose feelings during this period seemed to fluctuate in inverse proportion to those of the general public. By December, 1847, its horror and fear of the Pope's popularity had reached a stage of mild hysteria. In its most damning language, it told his readers that "Mariolatry, Jesuitism, Radicalism, these are the things whereof Pius IX, the idol of his Church, and the admiration of a thoughtless world, is the personification."\textsuperscript{53}

In December, 1847, the Quarterly Review undertook a survey of the first eighteen months of Pius IX's reign.\textsuperscript{54} It did not have the religious suspicions evidenced by the English Review and Fraser's and was able to render to the Pope due credit and honor while giving his acts a thorough criticism. At this early date, the Quarterly Review came closer to understanding the true situation of the Pope than any other member of the English press. Its judgments at this time were marked by a rare impartiality and an uncommon insight. "The restoration of the nationality of Italy," it said, "has been the cry of patriots in every age. It is now revived, and its herald and champion is the sovereign whose political existence is its greatest obstacle, and who, whatever may be his personal character, will ultimately be opposed

\textsuperscript{52}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{53}English Review, VIII (December 1847), 507.
to it."  
At the time of his election, the writer declared, Pius could not have opposed a program of reform had he wished. To this extent his efforts were not wholly spontaneous. The Quarterly Review, therefore, did not object to the fact of reform, but to the weakness and imprudence with which it saw them being carried out. It recognized that certain of the reforms were rather usurped than freely accorded, and concluded that Pius' "desire of innovation fostered by his imprudence" has left a general state of discontent not to be settled until "serious calamities have been inflicted."  

This view, written on the banks of the Thames, was infinitely closer to the real facts of the papal situation, than the on-the-spot report of the Times' Roman correspondent, who, early in December, found Rome so quiet and the people so contented that he had nothing to write about.  

The opening of the Consulta on November 15, 1847, had been the occasion of a serious but restrained clash between the Pope and the liberal party. Pius addressed the Consulta and tried to impress upon the members that they were to be a consultative body only, and that he did not intend the establishment of an institution inimical to or incompatible with his pontifical sovereignty. He had gone, he told them in so many words, just as far as he felt he could go along the path of representative institutions. The response of the Consulta to the Pope was an address cleverly drawn up  

54"Pius IX," Quarterly Review, LXXXII (December 1847), 231-260.  
55Ibid., p. 235.  
56Ibid., p. 236.  
57Times, December 6, 1847.
to request and push for reform of all existing grievances while seeming to place no infringement on administrative authority. The Consulta also included a request that the debates of its meetings be published in the press and all votes made public.\textsuperscript{58} From the standpoint and experience of English observers, the terms of the address must have appeared relatively moderate. The publication of the Consulta’s debates and divisions would hardly have seemed an extreme request to Englishmen accustomed to the Parliamentary column in British newspapers. Hence it is not surprising that the true character of this clash between the Pope and the liberals was not understood by most of the press. The \textit{Guardian} was one of the few who noted the tension surrounding the opening of the Consulta and surmised that the difficulty revolved around the reconciliation of papal authority and constitutional government. Since the \textit{Guardian} saw no way for the Pope to reconcile the differences between his own wishes and those of the liberals, it stood prepared to see Pius IX to draw back from his path of reform by some sudden and violent check.\textsuperscript{59} When at the end of December, Pius IX appointed Cardinal Bernetti as his Secretary of State, the \textit{Guardian} took it for a sign that the Pope was ready to suspend for a while the work of reform.\textsuperscript{60}

There were few observers like the \textit{Guardian} and the \textit{Quarterly Review}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{58} Berkeley, II, 329-331. The address of the Consulta to the Pope was printed in the \textit{Times}, December 6, 1847.
\item \textsuperscript{59} \textit{Guardian}, December 1, 1847. On the hesitancy of Pius IX at this point, \textit{v.} Berkeley, II, 326, 328-330; Aubert, p. 28.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Ibid., December 29, 1847. Also December 22, 1847.
\end{itemize}
With the *Daily News* in the vanguard, the *Times*, the *Edinburgh Review* and the majority of the press walked daily in the caravan of Pius IX and the Italian liberals. The opinion of this group at the end of 1847 might be succinctly summarized by this statement of the *Annual Register*: "The Pope continued steadily his course of wise and liberal policy....The conduct of Pius IX,...seems to promise a new era, not only in Italy, but throughout the Roman Catholic States of Europe." 61

Meanwhile, the hesitancy of the Pope in the face of liberal demands for constitutional government was observed and understood by the diplomatic corps of Europe. Metternich understood the danger which the Pope faced better, perhaps, than any other statesman, but Palmerston's grasp of the situation was by no means shallow. In a memorandum to all British ministers at the courts of Italian sovereigns, he urged them to counteract the danger from both the reactionary and revolutionary sides. They were instructed to encourage the reforms undertaken by the sovereigns and restrain, inasmuch as they were able, the violent passions of the popular leaders. 62 The aim of these moves was, as always to prevent that foreign interference which Palmerston so much dreaded.

By January the British press began to show some comprehension of the threat of revolution in Italy, but as yet it had no fear of its success.

61 *Annual Register* (1847), p. 396. The reactions of Americans at this time was similarly enthusiastic. Margaret Fuller, living in Rome, wrote two letters to R. W. Emerson describing Pius IX as having "a real great heart." Howard Marraro, "American Travellers in Rome, 1848-1850," *Catholic Historical Review, XXIX* (January 1944), 473-478.

62 Ashley, I, 4-5. For Metternich's views, v. Taylor, p. 53.
The Ferrara incident had concentrated so much attention on the threat of Austria that foreign interference was widely regarded as the only obstacle to moderate reform in the Italian states. Blackwood's, which despised radicals as "infidels and debauchees," saw, but did not reckon on, the possibility that the Italians might "run wild into the theory and practice of revolutionary wickedness, and...become the pest and abhorrence of all Europe." The Italian movement for constitutional government was scorned by this arch-conservative journal, which considered nine-tenths of the Italians unfit for anything but autocratic rule. Blackwood's desired to see "the dawn of Italian independence" preceded by a moral reawakening and the practice of the domestic virtues. Without that, it maintained, Italy would never be fit for free government. Because Pius IX was considered to have initiated this moral reawakening, Blackwood's treated him kindly and attributed to him all that was good in the reform movement in Italy. Had it not been for Pius IX, "the father of his people,...the whole impulse that has now been given to the various races of Italy would have been altogether wanting."

The threat of the revolutionists to the established governments in Italy was brought home to the English press by the uprising at Naples

---

63 "Switzerland and Italy," Blackwood's Magazine, LXIII (January 1848), 99. Blackwood's was an arch-Tory monthly dedicated to the ideals of order and rational liberty. In British politics, it stood at the extreme right, and in continental matters, it had a definite fondness for Metternich and Austria. For the history of Blackwood's in this period, v. Margaret Oliphant, William Blackwood and His Sons (New York, 1897), I and II.

64 Ibid., pp. 101, 102-105.
January 12, 1848. Fraser's was alarmed. Its immediate fears were for Austria, who, it conjectured, might be in real difficulty if revolutions sprang up simultaneously in all the Italian states. Its first reaction to the Neapolitan revolt was to rejoice over the "bold and resolute" stand made by Ferdinand II against the revolutionaries. Italy, Fraser's proclaimed, must look to men like him for her true regeneration. The Times was shaken and perturbed by the revolt. It instinctively went into a defense of its own and Palmerston's policy of giving encouragement to the Italian reform movement. While England, it declared, has shown "her sympathy for the progress of moderate reform, and her support of the independence of the Italian Princes, she has never dissembled her anxiety lest the popular impulse should become too strong." Faced with revolution in Italy, the Times toned down its former anti-Austrian theme and hastened to affirm that England "unequivocally recognized all those rights of Austria which are established upon the basis of the last great settlement of Europe." England had not intended, it added, "to hold out encouragement to what is called the independence of Italy, by which is meant the expulsion of the Austrians from that country." The Times was horrified to think that anyone in Europe had gathered an opposite opinion from its editorials.

65 Berkeley, III, 52-56.
66 "Austria and Italy," Fraser's, XXXVII (January 1848), 121-122.
67 Times, January 22, 1848.
68 Ibid.
The Guardian, too, expressed grave concern at the growth of radical strength in the Roman States, and though it was thoroughly in sympathy with the aims of Pius IX and the moderate liberals, it feared that, in a crisis, the moderates would desert the government and let the mob have its way.

As the revolutions of February and March, 1848, wore down English enthusiasm for the liberal movement on the Continent, Pius IX continued to receive the unwavering support of the British press. He, perhaps more than any other figure, represented to England British hopes and aims, not only for Italy, but for the liberal movement in Europe. He was pointed to as the prime example of that peaceful, moderate reform which English sentiment encouraged. The English affection for order and due process of law seemed to be personified in the Roman Pontiff. Perhaps the trouble with the Chartists in March and April, 1848, even led the British press to see a certain similarity between their own difficulties and those of the Pope. Moreover, Pius IX appeared as the ideal representative of the high-minded reformer, combining in himself the strength of moral virtue and the charm of a great personal attractiveness. He seemed to be the perfect liberal.

In a word, he seemed to be a progressive English gentleman.

While the English press was reflecting on the state of Italy, the liberals at Rome had begun a concerted campaign to isolate Pius IX from his conservative advisers and force him to grant a constitution. The well-trained and disciplined crowds were given cheerleaders who led them in

---

69 Guardian, January 12, 1848.

70 As Fraser's put it: "The whole of the Pope's proceedings appear to have been regulated by wisdom. Although naturally of an enthusiastic
chants of Viva Pio Nono solo! and Viva Constitution! A report of one of these disciplined demonstrations published by the Westminster Review indicated that the observer either had no idea of what was taking place before him or else the letter was part of the Italian liberals' public-relations campaign. In either case, the description of the event made it appear as a holiday celebration.\(^7\)

Trying to counter the pressure and leadership of the political clubs, Pius IX, on February 10, 1848, spoke to his people and protested his determination to withstand, by the institutions already conceded, all violence and disorder. He warned the people not to be moved by agitators attempting to inspire fear of an Austrian invasion. The papal see, he told them, was their best security.\(^7\)

Inadvertently, Pius IX destroyed the whole force of this protest by using near the end of the speech the exclamation: "O Gran Dio, benedite l'Italia." "O Great God, bless Italy!" In context, the exclamation was not a nationalist slogan, but that is what it quickly became, and that is the interpretation it received abroad.\(^7\)

On February 12, Pius made a still stronger protest to the
temperament, he has trained his enthusiasm to the pace of prudence." XXXVII (February 1848), 241.

\(^7\) On the chartist demonstrations and their failure on April 10, 1848, at Kennington Common, v. Halevy, IV, 236-248.

\(^7\) Westminster Review, XLIX (April 1848), 235-237. The writer's viewpoint is clear from these lines of the report: "I have already spoken of the order, tranquillity, and courtesy observable in popular commotions in Rome, and on the present occasion the people maintained their character in this respect....It was only like a great party taking a walk with smiling faces, and some with cigars in their mouths. Children even were not inconvenienced, or trampled on; elegantly dressed ladies walked, leaning on the arms of their husbands." p. 236.

\(^7\) Hales, Pio Nono, p. 70; Berkeley, III, 70-71.
crowds, but again the only effect of his words was to drive the spirits of the crowds still higher. The confusing nature of these events led to more confusion in the reporting of them. The state of the papal situation was obscured by ambiguity, so much so that Fraser's Magazine now felt that it could no longer deny the Pope's liberal intentions. Two factors which undoubtedly go a long way in accounting for the confusion of the British press at this time are the French revolution of February and the introduction of a bill in Parliament to restore diplomatic relations with the Papal States. The revolution in France diverted the greatest part of the attention of the press away from Italy and the Roman states, while the debates in the House of Lords on the bill to restore relations with Rome were carried on under the impression that the Pope was still in complete control of his state.

The bill to restore diplomatic relations with Rome was introduced in the House of Lords by Lord Lansdowne, a member of the cabinet, on February 7, 1848. Within three weeks it had passed its third reading and was sent down to the House of Commons, where, after a first reading early in March, it was shelved until August. The action of the government was swift, but that fact alone would not account for the absence of any significant adverse reaction from the country. Even from the conservatives and

74 As Aubert says, the blessing of Italy was received as being equivalently a curse for Austria. p. 30.

75 Mollat, p. 1691.

76 Fraser's, XXXVII (February 1848), 240.
churchmen who opposed the bill in the House of Lords, Pius IX received words of commendation whenever his name entered into the debates. The Bishop of St. David's called him an "illustrious individual...actuated by the very genius of good sense, and influenced by a spirit of the most exalted patriotism." The press, too, was highly favorable to the bill. The *Times* displayed a deep irritation with those who opposed the bill on religious grounds. The law prohibiting diplomatic relations with Rome, said the *Guardian*, "stands, amidst the institutions of the nineteenth century, like an old house in a new street, which its owner refuses to sell or pull down. It is dirty, ugly--rather picturesque, it is true, and a record of the past--but intolerably in the way....It only serves to perpetuate that kind of Fifth-of-November religion which embraces in our category the Pope, the Devil, and the Pretender, and places the whole duty of man in hating them." The *Rambler*, a Catholic journal, received the bill in hopeful anticipation. The opposition to the bill found a voice in *Fraser's*, which objected to the bill because it feared that the government planned to use it to rule Ireland through Rome. *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*

---

77 House of Lords, February 17, 1848. Hansard's, 3rd series, XCVI, 774.

78 *Times*, February 18 and 22, 1848. The *Times* had been urging the restoration of diplomatic relations with Rome ever since the autumn of 1846.

79 *Guardian*, February 16, 1848. Also February 23, 1848.

80 Cited in Ward, II, 192-193. The majority of Irish bishops and a number of prominent English Catholic laymen opposed the bill as detrimental to Catholic freedom. They feared that it would eventually give the government too much control of Catholic affairs in the British Isles.

81 "Diplomatic Relations with Rome," *Fraser's*, XXXVII (March 1848), 363.
suspected the government of the same motives, but it made no objection to the bill. 82

The fact which brought this particular objection to light was the publication on February 7, the same day the bill for restoring relations with Rome was introduced in the Lords, of a papal rescript forbidding the Irish clergy to engage in politics. The timing of the rescript, which was purely coincidental, and the fact that it was wholly in line with British governmental policy in Ireland, only added to the current consensus that the liberals in England and Pope Pius IX had a great deal in common. Early in March, 1848, Punch printed "The Delectable Ballad of the Four Kings of Italy," depicting Pius as the leader, tugging and pulling along the kings of Tuscany, Naples, and Piedmont, who drag their feet and move very reluctantly. The last stanza of the ballad ran thus:

And the Pope he leads a happy life
And bids them bless the day
That Young Italy did physic them
Whether they would or nay. 83

Rightly or wrongly, there was no doubt about the liberalism or nationalism of Pius IX.

March, 1848, saw Europe convulsed by revolutions and mollified with rapidly granted constitutions. On March 5 Charles Albert of Piedmont granted a constitution at Turin. Eight days later Vienna erupted and Metternich fled. Revolution followed upon revolution: Berlin, March 15;

82 Tait's Edinburgh Magazine, n.s. XV (March 1848), 205. Founded in 1832, Tait's was a popular monthly for general reading and entertainment. In its discussion of political matters, it was generally quite liberal.

83 Punch, XIV (March 11, 1848), 104.
Milan, March 17; Venice, March 18. Pius IX avoided a revolution only by dispersing the Jesuits at Rome, granting a constitution on March 15, and accepting a liberal ministry. Charles Albert was able to stave off imminent revolt by declaring war on Austria March 24. Faced with this same war-fever at Rome, the most that Pius IX would do was to send a large part of the papal troops to defend the Romagna frontiers against possible Austrian attack. For the liberals that act was enough—for the time being. They were quite sure that they could force the Pope's hand when they deemed his action necessary to their cause.

The first reaction in Britain to the upheavals in Vienna and Italy was one of shock. Austria, the Times remarked in astonishment, is dissolving like a giant snowman. But once it recovered from the impact of the first reports of the revolutions, the Times began to step down very firmly on the side of what it believed to be the forces of law and order, or, in this case, the established governments. When Piedmont invaded Lombardy at the end of March, the Times condemned the invasion and the principle of nationalism upon which the invasion was undertaken. It regarded "the scheme of remodelling the territorial arrangements of Europe in strict conformity to the laws of race as a chimera." 85

The Guardian paid more attention to the Pope at this time than did many other journals, and it found itself badly confused over what it believed to be the attempts of Pius IX to reconcile his roles as Pope and

84 Times, March 30, 1848.
85 Ibid., April 5, 1848.
as an Italian prince. Which hand blesses, and which draws the sword? it asked. 86 For the next few months the Guardian labored under the impression that Pius was as much responsible for forcing the war with Austria as his liberal ministry. 87 In the light of the events of the preceding year, this viewpoint is understandable, but just why it took so long to be dispelled is hard to say. More than likely, the confusion in England before the end of April, 1848, was due to the ambiguity of the Pope's actions and his refusal to take a decisive position on an issue disclosing the breach between himself and the liberals.

The dispersal of the Jesuits by Pius IX in March disquieted the Guardian at least as much as did the war with Austria, not because it loved the Jesuits, but because it saw in that act of the Pope a bending of the papacy to ultra-liberal and democratic control. The "Pontiff has been merged in the Prince; the Christian in the patriot; and Pius has done what the Gospel would have forbidden, but his party—the party of European liberty, have required of him." 88 Any pope, it feared, who would sacrifice to his political position such a main support as the Jesuits will soon, under the same compulsions, make concessions "unequivocally detrimental to the faith common to him and to ourselves." 89 This was, indeed, no shallow concern.

86 Guardian, April 5, 1848.

87 Not until August, 1848, did the Guardian accept the fact that Pius IX was attempting to forestall rather than encourage a war with Austria. Guardian, August 23, 1848.

88 Ibid., April 12, 1848.

89 Ibid.
From July, 1847, to April, 1848, then, Pius IX's popularity with the British press continued to rise. To his role of reformer was added that of the Savior of Italy. Insofar as the national salvation of Italy was to be undertaken along lines marked by moderate reform and peace, the press never faltered in supporting him, for there existed a general agreement that good government and moderate reform by the princes of Italy was in itself enough to liberate Italy from foreign domination. The press was also in general agreement, at least until the time of the March revolutions, that Italian independence would only be hindered by any war with Austria. Indeed, war was seen as the most disastrous policy possible because it could only mean the reinforcement of Austrian control once the battles were over. That Italy could defeat Austria in a struggle of arms was a possibility not even considered. It was against that background that Pius IX's successful challenge of Austria in 1847 won for him the esteem of the English press.

So much attention was paid to the Pope as a national leader, however, that few observers in the British press saw him drawing away from the liberals in December, 1847, and in the early months of 1848. His troubles were lost in the excitement of the revolutions and in the ambiguity of his own language and acts. Up to the very eve of the great crisis of his early years, therefore, Englishmen wrote of Pius IX as the Liberal Pope and the leader of Italy. They were poorly prepared to understand and interpret the turn of events in the following months.
CHAPTER III

THE CRISIS: April-November 1848

The months of April-November, 1848, were months of crisis for Pius IX. From that day in February when he uttered these words, "O Gran Dio, Benedite l'Italia," the control of public opinion had passed out of his hands. From April to November, he was in the midst of a constant struggle to see that the control of the government did not likewise pass from his grasp. In the end, he failed.

The pressure of the Roman war-hawks upon Pius IX was maintained throughout April. Everywhere in Italy liberals were calling upon Pio Nono to preach the crusade of nationalism. His name was a battle cry in Lombardy and Venetia. General Durando, commanding the papal troops in the Romagna, attempted to force the Pope's hand by issuing on April 5 a proclamation condemning Austria and insinuating that Pius IX had given his full blessing to the Italian cause. Pius denounced the proclamation in private to his associates, but his ministers persuaded him to limit his public statement to a mild, and therefore ambiguous, protest. On April 25 the ministers of Pius IX presented him with a collective memorial urging

---

2. Hales, Pio Nono, pp. 73-74.
3. Ibid., p. 74.
a declaration of war as the only alternative to revolution.⁴ Even Cardinal Antonelli and other churchmen urged the Pope to choose war as the lesser of two evils. Public opinion and the necessity of the time, they said, demanded it.⁵

Pius IX, however, was determined that the Vicar of Christ would not declare war unless attacked by Austria in his own states. He wanted no part of an offensive war of nationalism. He was greatly afraid that a war would only insure the triumph of the irreligious revolutionaries of Mazzini's type. Therefore he sat down to write a clear statement of the policy of the papacy and issued on April 29 an allocution censuring the extremist faction and protesting his unwillingness to declare an offensive war. The allocution was originally intended to reassure the patriots, but whether it was because Pius underestimated the zeal of the liberals for the war with Austria, or because Cardinal Antonelli surreptitiously retouched certain parts of the allocution,⁶ it did not produce the intended effect.

The radicals at Rome called the allocution a volte-face; others named it the "treason" of Pius IX.⁷ Overnight the Pope's popularity vanished, and open revolution was avoided only with the aid of Count Terenzo Mamiani, a liberal, who formed a new ministry on terms which displeased both Pope and radicals. The Pope had to agree that the papal troops which, under Durando, had crossed into Lombardy to fight with Piedmont against Austria, would not be recalled.⁸ The radicals, for their part, were displeased

---

⁴ Mollat, p. 1691.
⁵ Engel-Janosi, Catholic Historical Review, XXXVI, 134-135.
because they had not won from Pius an open declaration of war. The final outcome of the conflict was that, to all intents and purposes, the Pope was left as a reigning 'prisoner.' There remained, however, a chance that he might regain enough control to keep the government from falling into the hands of the radicals. His efforts were complicated by the early successes of the Piedmontese forces and papal troops against the Austrians and by economic difficulties and shortages within the Papal States. 10

On May 2 Pius IX appealed to the Austrian Emperor to withdraw his troops from Lombardy and put an end to the war. The Austrian forces, under the wily and cautious Radetsky, held out, however, in the relatively impregnable Quadrangle. 11 By June Radetsky received sufficient reinforcements from Vienna to undertake an offense. The papal armies were defeated at Vicenza and Cornuda, and on July 25, Radetsky crushed the Piedmontese forces in the decisive battle of Custozza. The war was over.

The defeat forced Mamiani's ministry to resign. He was succeeded by another liberal, Count Fabbri, who proved less than competent in dealing with the unrest and economic difficulties in the Papal States. He lasted

6 The complete English text of this allocution may be found in R. M. Johnston, The Roman Theocracy and the Republic: 1846-1849 (London, 1901), pp. 357-361. For more information on Pius IX's state of mind at this time, see the report of his interview on April 20 with the Tuscan ambassador Bargagli. Berkeley, III, Appendix I, 465-468.

7 Aubert, p. 31.

8 Ibid., pp. 31-32; Berkeley, III, 182-183.

9 Hales, Pio Nono, p. 78.

10 Aubert, p. 32.
until September 14, when his disillusionment with liberal job-seekers and radical extremists made him resign in disgust. On September 16 Pius IX called to head the government the only strong man in Rome, Count Pellogrino Rossi. With a firm hand and little care for the outcries of the extremists, Rossi set about restoring order. He was not popular, but he was successful, and the revolutionary party realized that if Rossi succeeded in establishing a compromise between the Pope and the constitutional liberals, their chance at power would be gone. Therefore they agreed that Rossi must be got rid of. They made careful plans for his assassination and dramatically executed them on November 15, the day set for the second opening of the Consulta.

It took the British press some time to realize the implications of the events of April. Fraser's, looking over the situation, thought the trouble in Italy lay only in the extremes of north and south. It considered central Italy quite tranquil. The Times gave no indication before May that Pius was in serious trouble. The Guardian remained troubled and confused. The British Quarterly Review was still regarding the Pope with

---

11 A strongly fortified area held by the fortresses of Peschiera, Verona and Mantua, situated on the rivers Mincio and Adige.

12 Hales, Pio Nono, pp. 82-83.

13 Ibid., p. 90.

14 "Italy," Fraser's, XXXVII (April 1848), 487.

15 The Times, like the Guardian, was going under the impression that Pius IX was still in step with the nationalist movement. Times, April 17, 1848.

16 Guardian, April 26, 1848.
eyes of adulation as the leader and reformer of Italy. It recognized that
the constitution granted in March had cost Pius some pain, but that fact
seemed of no more significance than the pulling of a tooth. The British
Quarterly Review was satisfied with the constitution and felt that it con­
ceded quite enough power for the liberals to secure civil liberty for the
people of the Papal States. 17

The reaction to the allocution of April 29 was, on the whole, unfavor­
able to the Pope. The liberal journals tended to support the Italian lib­
erals and the war with Austria; the conservative journals believed that
Pius IX was receiving what he deserved for his flirtation with democracy.
The Times was one of the few who were pleased with the allocution and
expressed their sympathy with the Pope. Already tending to the side of
reaction, it was happy to note that Pius IX had earnestly disclaimed "the
connexion which the revolutionary party had sought to establish between his
policy and their own subversive designs." The action of the liberals was
termed "an act of treachery and hostility to the moderate and national
party in Italy." The war, said the Times, can only result in the burdening
of Italy with new taxes and the discarding of "a whole age of improve­
tment.\ 18

The Guardian wasted no tears on the Pope's defeat by the liberals.
It felt that by encouraging the conflict with Austria, he had drawn down
those troubles on his own head and could now not expect to escape the con­
sequences by appealing to his spiritual position as head of the universal

17 "Italy: Its State and Prospects," British Quarterly Review, VII
(May 1848), 464-495. Founded in 1845, this review was chiefly a Congrega­
tionalist organ edited 1845-1865 by R. Vaughn. In politics it followed the
Whig party.
The English Review fairly gloated over Pius' loss of popularity and his downfall. "How are the mighty fallen!" it exclaimed. The whole course of Pius' reign was presented to its readers as one huge, concerted drive for power by the papacy. The determination to embrace liberal politics was a matter of cold calculation, not of enthusiasm, it said. That Rome could never sincerely embrace the principles of radicalism, the writer continued, is so evident that the only wonder is how anyone could have conceived the idea of a bona fide radical Pope. "The only principle in which the Papacy has any faith," he declared, "is that of its own supremacy over all the powers of the world." The cause of the Pope's downfall was considered to have been the highly imprudent attempt to ally Catholicism with the ungodly force of democracy and the infidel spirit of radicalism. Where Pius IX thought to control the movement for his own purposes, he now discovers that he is instead the one being controlled. Therefore, the English Review saw the allocution and the withdrawal from liberalism as the sign of the failure of the papal experiment.

The Quarterly Review, unlike the English Review, found no cause for rejoicing in the difficulties of the papal situation. Like the Guardian, it had a mature concern for the future of Christianity. If Roman Catholicism be overthrown, it said, there is little hope that anything but impiety should rise from the ruins. The Quarterly Review infinitely preferred the

---

18 Times, May 15, 1848.

19 Guardian, May 10, 1848.

Pope and Catholicism to Mazzini and the anti-Christian democratic element in Europe. 21

Nevertheless, this expressed preference did not prevent the Quarterly Review from taking Pius IX to task as the originator of Italy's current troubles. "It is to Pius IX that all this complicated evil is mainly owing," the article charged; "no man ever erred more grossly--or in a way more sure of speedy retribution." By allying himself with the liberals and by opposing the Jesuits, Pius IX was thought to have annihilated his temporal power and imperilled his spiritual authority "more than did the reformation of Luther or the encroachments of Bonaparte." His downfall had been foreseen, the writer continued, but its suddenness was entirely unexpected. The downfall was, however, but the "consummation of the ingratitude that sooner or later awaits the sovereign who tampers with the courtship of the mob." The fatal weakness, the tragic flaw in the character of Pius IX, believed the writer, was his "fatal love of popularity." To this the Pope "has sacrificed his throne, his order, his religion." Now that he had become "a prisoner in his own capital," concluded the Quarterly Review, he cannot be expected to retain even a nominal control much longer. 22

Blackwood's looked upon the allocution as "a penitential speech," a confession of sins. Though it too looked upon Pius IX as the instigator of the revolutionary movement in Italy, Blackwood's now pressed the fallen Pope to its bosom and absolved him from his guilt.

21 "Revolutions in Italy," Quarterly Review, LXXXIII (June 1848), 215-217.
22 Ibid., pp. 237-239.
In all this chapter of change, whatever may be the
coolness of our respect for the Papacy, we feel for
the Pope, as we should feel for any man intolerably
insulted by a conspiracy of wretches pampered into
gross arrogance by sudden power. His personal char-
acter is unimpeachable,... and if his vanity has met
with a sudden and bitter reproof, it is only the
vanity of an Italian.23

Blackwood's attitude seems very much like that of a bluff British gentle-
man—condescending, to be sure, but a gentleman nonetheless. It could
forgive and forget.

During this period the liberal journals were generally more sympathe-
tic to Pius IX than were the conservative journals. His reputation with
them suffered only to the extent that they now believed the Pope to have
been a well-intentioned man, but one "seemingly not equal to the exigen-
cies of his position."24 The Edinburgh Review backed down from its former
enthusiasm, but it still credited Pius with having made a sincere effort to
alleviate the abuses present in the Papal States at the time of his elec-
tion. He had endeavored, said the Edinburgh Review, "with great prudence,
with great caution, and with great singleness of purpose," to carry out the
suggestions of the Memorandum of 1831. Therefore, it declared, Pius IX
"neither deserves blame as a rash innovator, a radical reformer, a fire-
brand, and so forth, nor the extravagant praises which have been lavished
on him as having been of himself the regenerator and liberator of Italy;
he is a plain honest man, who most probably did not see the consequences of

23 "Lombardy and the Italian War," Blackwood's, LXIII (June 1848),
744, 748-749.

24 "Italy--the Papacy," Tait's, n.s. XV (July 1848), 484.
his honesty, or, if he did, said to himself, fiat justitia ruat coelum."

The liberal press felt that in spite of the fact that Pius IX was not the man they had hoped for, nevertheless he had contributed certain notable achievements to the liberal cause. The Edinburgh Review was of the opinion that Pius deserved the gratitude of all Italy for his opposition to Austria, which it called "a gigantic step towards the deliverance of Italy." Tait's Edinburgh Magazine, which openly favored the liberal movement in Italy and in Europe, believed that Pius had made a great contribution to Europe by separating the papacy from its antecedent policies and by giving his adhesion to "the democratic principle."27

That the personal character of the Pope was under rather heavy attack at this time, particularly from conservative and church-affiliated journals is evidenced by the Dublin Review which undertook a vigorous defense of the papal character.28 First of all it attempted to correct the 'erroneous' notions on which the attacks were based. Pius IX never was, or ever had been a liberal, the writer said. Analyzing the aims and goals of Pius at the time of his election, the writer showed considerable insight when he pointed out the Pope had been determined "to remove all causes of suffering to his people and to remedy every abuse," but no more.29 Pius contemplated

25 "The Revolt in Lombardy," Edinburgh Review, LXXXVIII (July 1848), 78.
26 Ibid.
27 Tait's, n.s. XV, 484.
28 "Pius the Ninth," Dublin Review, XXIV (June 1848), 449-487.
29 Ibid., p. 480.
generous measures, the review declared, not liberal ones. The writer went on to refute the charges that Pius IX was ambitious, vain, and of a weak character. He tried to show that the stand taken by the Pope in the allocution of April 29 was not due to weakness, but to a sincere concern and respect for his duties as head of the Catholic Church.

The Dublin Review contented itself with this effort to defend the Pope's character. It had no discussion of the course followed by Pius IX or of its significance for Italy or the Church. In view of the fact that, except for very minor references, this article was the only discussion of Pius IX carried by the Dublin Review during the years 1846-1850, the omission of any discussion of issues is quite significant. Very probably this silence was due to the conservatism of the editors and their reluctance to criticize the Pope, even if they happened to dislike his acts. At all events, the review contributed very little to the formation of press opinion on issues and events concerning Pius IX.

During the summer of 1848, British sympathies generally ran in favor of the Italians, though a strong body of conservative opinion still voiced its opposition to the radical element in the liberal movement. The strength of this pro-Italian sentiment must not be over-estimated, however, for most Englishmen were far more concerned with the cholera epidemic and home affairs in England than with the progress of the Italian liberals. The Austrian comeback in July was something of a surprise, and caught both the press and the British government off-guard.\footnote{Charles Greville, Greville Memoirs, ed. Henry Reeve, (New York, 1885), II, 347.} The defeat of the
Piedmontese forces at Custozza, however, did little to change the general feeling. The state of the British press after Custozza was pretty much as before, except for the addition of some expressed disappointment at the showing of the Italian armies.31

By August, 1848, the situation of the Pope at Rome was generally considered to be hopeless. The Papal States were torn by unrest and disturbances created by economic difficulties and the return of defeated soldiers unwilling to settle back into the former routine. Pius IX was regarded as a prisoner rather than as a ruler.32 It seems, nevertheless, that he continued to hold the sympathy of most of the press in England although it gradually abandoned its former hope of his being a leading force in the moderate liberal transformation of Italy. Tait's compared his position to that of Louis XVI vis-a-vis the Estates-General. The Pope had called into being a movement which soon passed beyond his former intention and control. Tait's took the side of the liberal party, which, it believed, was only asserting the rights of the people.33

The real significance of the Italian affair, declared the writer of the article in Tait's, was principally religious. The papacy was tottering, he said, and after it was gone, the Catholic religion, too, would soon pass away. In the meantime, the destruction of the temporal power would go a long way toward reducing Roman Catholicism to a mere sect, and the Pope to

31 Times, August 4, 8, 17, 1848.
32 Aubert, pp. 32-33.
33 "Rome," Tait's, n.s. XV (August 1848), 542.
a mere bishop, "whose influence would be perfectly trifling." 34

Another journal which viewed the troubles of the Pope chiefly from the side of its religious significance was the North British Review. 35 Unlike other church-affiliated organs, this Evangelical journal did not assess the merits of Pius IX solely on its own feelings for Catholicism. In fact, the North British Review manifested a sincere appreciation of and understanding of what the Pope had accomplished. From the viewpoint of religion, however, it could not help but look with a mild satisfaction upon events which seemed to presage the destruction of all papal power and influence. 36

The North British Review believed that the failure of Pius' reforms was due to the impossibility of restoring so corrupt and corroded an institution as the papacy. In trying to reconcile papacy and liberalism, it said, his failure was inevitable, for he was forcing the coordination of incompatibles. That Pius IX, a "true and earnest Pope," had made the effort was his justification. The main lesson to be gathered from this onrush of events, the writer concluded, was "that the functions of royalty and priesthood are incompatible in an age of progress...that the Church and State must be two, and reciprocally independent." Whether the Pope sought support from despotism or liberalism, the writer prophesied, "his temporal authority is doomed." 37

34 Ibid., pp. 541-542.
36 Ibid., p. 419.
An index to the state of public opinion on the subject of Pius IX in August, 1848, may be taken from the debates in the House of Commons on the bill to restore diplomatic relations with Rome. In the midst of the uncertainty about the position of the Pope at Rome, Palmerston introduced the bill for its second reading in Commons on August 17. The bill met more opposition here than it had in the Lords, and Palmerston reduced his defense of the bill to reasons of commerce and communications with British possessions in the Near and Far East. Nevertheless, the government carried the vote on both the second and third readings by solid majorities. The royal assent was given, and the law proceeded to become a dead letter.

The Anglican clergy did not fail to petition against the bill; 3500 of them signed a petition expressing the "strongest objections" to it. They showed themselves the more concerned because of Pius IX's growing influence in England. From County Ayr in Scotland came a petition calling the bill "offensive and hateful to almighty God, ... dangerous and pernicious in its consequences to these kingdoms, ... dishonorable and insulting to the Crown, ... utterly abhorent to the conscientious feelings of the soundest Protestant subjects of Her Majesty." All told, the signatures petitioning against the bill totalled 46,000, and the Times found the significance of this number only in its being considerably less than the number of signatures petitioning against the emancipation bill in 1829.

37 Ibid., pp. 420, 428-429, 430.
38 Hansard's, 3rd series, CI, 201-204.
39 The vote on the second reading (August 17) was 125-46; third reading (August 29), 88-25. The Royal assent was given August 31. Cf. Ward, II, 203.
In the fall of 1848, the British press gave quite a bit of space to discussing the past, present, and future of Pius IX and the papacy. The occasion of this show of interest was the publication of a book, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century Contrasted with its Past Condition*, (3 vols., London, 1848), by James Whiteside. This author was of the opinion that Pius IX was a reformer in spite of himself and that he had been led to grant constitutional government wholly against his will. The Pope, Whiteside maintained, had intended "to govern honestly, but absolutely," reforming the administration of the Papal States while keeping all legislative power to himself. "He was shouted into popularity," Whiteside claimed, "without meaning to be the assertor of liberty." Give or take a little English liberal bias, he was not far wrong.

The review of this book in *Bentley's Miscellany* shows that that journal was already convinced of Whiteside's interpretation. The *Quarterly Review* slightly disagreed. Whiteside, it said, gave Pius IX credit for good sense as well as good intentions, but, said the *Quarterly Review*, it was precisely in good sense that he was deficient. The reviewer charged that Pius had been politically immature and imprudent, overestimating the strength of the powers he reserved to himself and mistakenly banking on the people's

40 *Times*, July 20, 1848.
41 Ibid.
42 Ibid., August 18, 1848.
43 James Whiteside (1804-1876); born in Ireland, educated at Trinity College, Dublin (1822). Practiced law in the Irish courts, made queen's counsel 1842. Won a great reputation for his defence of Daniel O'Connell in state trials of 1843. Later defended Smith O'Brien in 1848. Entered
love, respect, and gratitude, "which never yet had any influence in a time of revolution."\textsuperscript{47}

Whiteside's book also raised the question of who in Italy had given birth to the revolutionary movement. Blackwood's, the Quarterly Review, Tait's, the Edinburgh Review and some others were in agreement that the initial force had come from Pius IX. It was he, said Tait's, who revived, directed, and channeled the common aspirations after liberty and the antipathies to oppression. Liberal or conservative, most of the press gave the Pope credit for that much at least. Bentley's Miscellany, on the other hand, held the minority opinion that Pius IX "was not the author of the Revolution." He merely provided the occasion and was wholly unaware of what he was doing.\textsuperscript{49}

The press was also in general agreement that the temporal power of the papacy was doomed to extinction, though, as has already been seen, there were diverse opinions as to what implications that fact held for the Pope's spiritual authority.

Parliament in 1850 as a conservative. Held various posts until being elevated to the position of Chief Justice for Ireland shortly after 1866, a position he held until his death. Dictionary of National Biography, XXI, 122-123.

\textsuperscript{44} Bentley's Miscellany, XXIV (1848), 305, 306.
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\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., p. 559.

\textsuperscript{48} Tait's, n.s. XV (October 1848), 689.
Speculation on the immediate future of Pius IX ran to several directions. Some believed that he would soon be forced to seek refuge in exile, possibly in England. Others thought that a compromise might yet be effected and order restored. The fact of the Pope's continued presence in Rome and his appointment of Count Rossi caused this second supposition to be regarded as more likely. The Times, in particular, looked for Rossi to re-establish order and put the papal government in working condition once more. It believed that he was the man to put down the threat of the revolutionists of Mazzini.\textsuperscript{50} Ironically, this editorial of the Times in praise and support of Rossi was printed five days after he had received the thrust of an assassin's stilleto in his throat.

\textsuperscript{49}Bentley's Miscellany, XXIV (1848), 306.

\textsuperscript{50}Times, November 20, 1848.
CHAPTER IV

REVOLUTION AND THE ROMAN REPUBLIC: November 1848–June 1849

Had Pellogrino Rossi lived, he might conceivably have carried the government of Pius IX through the crisis and restored stability to that degree where some compromise could be effected between the Pope and the liberal advocates of constitutional government and a united Italy. His assassination, however, destroyed all hope of a peaceful settlement.

The murder of Rossi literally shocked the greatest part of the British press. The Annual Register termed it "a horrible event." Fraser's was absolutely bewildered at this eruption of violence. It had supposed that the Pope, with Rossi's aid, had already weathered the storm and was returning the Papal States to a more normal condition. The Quarterly Review, the Guardian, and the Times reacted swiftly with outbursts of horror and indignation, for despite Rossi's unpopularity at Rome, he was regarded in England as the only able statesman capable of preserving Rome from anarchy and complete disorder. Rossi perished, said the Times,

because he was the most illustrious statesman of Italy—the chief defense of the Papal throne—a man endowed with intellect and ambition enough to risk his life at fearful odds against the paroxysms of this revolutionary time.

---

1Annual Register (1848), p. 330.
2"Insurrection in Rome," Fraser's, XXXVIII (December 1848), 721.
Seldom has a man been so highly eulogized by the Times as was Rossi. In grand and lofty language, Rossi's character, will, and intellect received the highest praise. Pius IX also shared in that outpouring of tribute as "a Pontiff whose chief crime has been his excessive anxiety to give her [Rome] the blessings of constitutional government and social liberty." The revolutionists, on the other hand, were described in the darkest tones as the "savage mob," the "assassins," and the "sanguinary rabble."  

When the Times learned that, as a result of the violence at Rome, the French government was preparing to send 3500 troops to Rome as a personal safeguard of the Pope, it thought the action "justified and required" and no violation of international law. The Times even wished that the British marines of the Mediterranean fleet might be allowed to cooperate in providing for the Pope's safety. The Guardian was also in favor of the proposed French action and felt it would be an honor for a British man-of-war to carry the Pope to safety.  

It is true to say that the assassination of Rossi almost completely discredited the Italian liberals in the eyes of the British press. They were now looked upon as a gang of inconstant and untrustworthy cutthroats and mobsters. Letters and rumors to that effect were everywhere. The dispatches of the Duc d'Harcourt, the French minister at Rome, describing the murder and the subsequent disturbances at Rome, received widespread  
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3 Guardian, December 6, 1848; Quarterly Review, LXXXIV (December 1848), 226; Times, November 27, 1848.
4 Times, November 27, 1848.
5 Ibid., and November 28, 1848.
circulation throughout the press. The radical *Daily News*, on the other hand, seems to have been wholly in the hands of enthusiasts for the Italian cause. It never wavered in its support of the "revolution," but in December, 1848, its views were those of a very small minority.

Once Rossi was dead, the papal government collapsed and all effective power passed to the political clubs of Rome. Pius IX was stripped of his Swiss Guard, forced to accept a radical liberal ministry, and made a virtual prisoner in the Quirinal. Hence he determined to flee Rome and remove himself from the control of the radicals as the first step in regaining his full power. With the aid of the diplomatic corps, which was almost unanimous in its sympathy for him, Pius secretly effected his escape from the city on the evening of November 24. Having taken that step, he could no longer control the situation at Rome, for though he appointed a government to rule the city in his absence, the Pope's men were helpless and could only stand and watch the radicals take charge.

The flight of the Pope from Rome evoked from the British press further manifestations of sympathy for him and abhorrence for the radicals. The *Guardian* expressed the general opinion of the press when it called the
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7 *Guardian*, December 6, 1848.

8 See letters and reports in the *Times*, November 25 and 29, 1848.

9 *Ibid.*, December 1, 1848; *Guardian*, December 6, 1848.


11 Aubert, p. 34; Hales, *Pio Nono*, pp. 92-95, 129; Berkeley, III, 446, 447-460.
proposed Roman republic "a misfortune in every way"—for Rome, for Italy, and for the world. Queen Victoria sent a personal letter of sympathy to the Pope, and the general public deplored the outrages suffered by him.

Yet the flight of the Pope came as no great surprise. The murder of Rossi and the reports of a disordered Rome had been a sufficient preparation for the event. The flight itself was not even regarded as being highly significant because there was a common presumption that the Pope would soon be restored to his throne. As the Guardian put it, the Pope is like a child's toy leaded at the bottom. Hit it as hard as you like, and though it wobbles and twists for a time, it will sooner or later stand before you settled and stationary. Everything, the Guardian said, "is sure to come out right again." The Times held a similar view, but, somewhat vindictively, it hoped that no one would intervene to restore the Pope until the Roman people had well tasted the "detestable reign" of the vicious republicans. Another reason for the general lack of excitement over the Pope's flight was the very low estimate which the British press entertained about the ability of the revolutionists to rule and keep control once they had effective power in their hands.

12 Guardian, December 6, 1848.

13 Hales, Pio Nono, p. 129. Hales says: "Almost all governments... offered him help of some sort. Diplomatic recognition was not accorded by any of them to the revolutionary government at Rome. With this attitude both the government and public opinion in England for the time being concurred." Ibid.

14 Guardian, December 6, 1848.

15 Times, December 4, 1848.
Nevertheless, almost all of the British press felt that in some way the flight of the Pope held rather meaningful implications for the future of the Papacy. The Guardian, showing deep concern, believed that the event marked the consummation of the movement in Western history to separate the priesthood from all control of temporal power and secular affairs. Blackwood's thought it exhibited a memorable warning to future ages of the peril of commencing reform in high places and proved the falsity of liberal principles. It also believed that the event manifested the impossibility of reconciling Roman-Catholicism with political innovation. The Westminster Review and the English Review were at one in judging that if the event were not "exactly equivalent to an absolute extinction of the Papacy," there was very little hope of its ever recovering from the blow. The Times, on the contrary, was not so sure that the spiritual power of the Popes was coming to an end. Indeed, it seemed quite perplexed and at a loss to explain how, despite the failure of Pius IX in his liberal experiment, the papacy had grown to such large influence in both Europe and America.

After the initial wave of sympathy passed and it became clear that Pius IX was not going to return to Rome very quickly, the British press began to have second thoughts on the wisdom of the flight. The Times:

16 Guardian, December 6 and 13, 1848.
17 "The Year of Revolutions," Blackwood's, LXV (January 1849), 5.
18 Westminster Review, L (January 1849), 605; English Review, X (December 1848), 321.
19 Times, December 4, 1848.
Roman correspondent was convinced that the flight was imprudent and injudicious, but this judgment was not shared by the Times' editor, who maintained that the absence of Pius IX would once and forever establish the ineptitude of the Roman radicals before the eyes of the world and Rome. The Guardian speculated as to whether Pius might not finally refuse to return to Rome and, instead, take up his residence elsewhere in the world, possibly America or even Australia.

During December, 1848, and January, 1849, there were at Rome no leaders who had not been associated with the assassination of Rossi. To make matters worse for the reputation of the radicals, the moderate liberals withdrew from the heat of the struggle, and a number of them left Rome. The reports of Roman activity which reached England were, on the whole, uncomplimentary and discrediting. Rome lay under a sentence of guilt. Moreover, popular sentiment in Rome was reported to favor the return of the Pope. The Times' correspondent wrote that he expected a popular demonstration to recall the Pope without the necessity of any foreign intervention. Therefore, as 1848 drew to a close, there prevailed in the British press a disgust with the provisional government at Rome. The Annual Register

20 Ibid., December 12, 1848.
21 Ibid., December 7 and 26, 1848.
22 Guardian, December 13, 1848.
23 Blackwood's, the Quarterly Review, and the Times were among the foremost anti-Roman propagandists. E.g. "Italian Intervention," Quarterly Review, LXXXIV (December 1848), 222-225.
24 Times, December 20, 23, 1848, and January 13, 1849.
summarized this feeling when it concluded that the Roman government had given no evidence of its possessing a single member competent to deal with the difficulties of its position or to construct a scheme of rational policy. With the reading public in England, liberal or conservative, such a judgment was quite damning.

On December 29, 1848, the provisional government at Rome decreed the calling of a Roman Constituent Assembly for February 5, 1849. The elections were to be held in January. The Pope forbade all Catholics to participate in the elections, and since the moderate liberals withdrew voluntarily from any close association with the radicals, it was a foregone conclusion that the voting would result in a victory for the radicals. Except for these moves which rather solidified the revolution, the Roman situation underwent no significant change in January.

In England, the turn of the new year found editors trying to probe the meaning of the European experience of 1848. They were impressed with the fact of revolution, but for the most part, they tended to concentrate on a theme of thanksgiving for England's having gone through the storm untouched. The Times expressed the common feeling when it remarked that 1848 had proved England internally strong and quite independent of the currents moving through Europe. Ruminating in this mood of complacency, it now hoped that the British government would stay clear of the Italian situation entirely.

26 Aubert, pp. 35-36; Hales, Pio Nono, pp. 95-98.
27 Times, January 1 and 3, 1849. Also Fraser's, XXXIX (January 1849), 1; and Bentley's Miscellany, XXV (1849), 154.
The strain of isolationism running through these remarks was somewhat general throughout the pages of the British press. Her advice and leadership scorned, England wanted no more to do with the unruly governments on the Continent.

The French, meanwhile, still maintained at Toulon the expeditionary force which had been prepared to intervene for the personal safety of the Pope. His flight and subsequent residence at Gaeta made the French move superfluous. The force, however, was not disbanded, which fact placed it in an ambiguous position before the eyes of Europe, for early in December, 1848, Louis Napoleon had been elected president of the Second Republic, and the name of Napoleon left Englishmen uneasy. It was not known whether the French would now intervene in Italy on behalf of the Pope or the revolution.29 One London paper termed the French expedition "inexpedient, untoward, and ill-advised."30 The Times disagreed. It felt that were France to intervene on the side of Pius IX it would be rendering "an essential service to the cause of peace and order." The Times favored the expedition on several grounds: first, it would restore Pius IX to the rightful possession of his dominions; secondly, it would commit France to the side of law and order, or, in other words, the side of reaction; and thirdly, the action of France would insure that the restoration of the Pope would not be carried out without the placing of some guarantees against future despotism.

28 *Times*, January 1 and 6, 1849.
29 Ibid., January 18, 1849.
30 Ibid.
in the Papal States.\textsuperscript{31}

At Rome, the Constituent Assembly met for the first time February 5. Four days later it decreed the end of the temporal power of the papacy and the establishment of the Republic of Rome. The papal response to this action was an appeal for help to France, Austria, Spain and Naples.\textsuperscript{32}

The decrees of the Assembly at Rome characteristically evoked a new outburst of loathing and indignation from the \textit{Times},\textsuperscript{33} and the \textit{Guardian} would have been only too happy to see someone disperse "this nest of hornets," though it was sure that, if given the time, the Roman people would do it themselves.\textsuperscript{34} If intervention from an outside source proved necessary, the \textit{Guardian} would have liked to see it handled by Naples and Sardinia.

That English press opinion, in late February, 1849, was still largely behind Pius IX is evident from an observation of a \textit{Times} editorial which noted that some people in England who had so strongly favored the liberal cause in Italy were now just as strongly urging the necessity of intervention to put out the radicals.\textsuperscript{35} The \textit{Times} would not be found so "precipitous." It still desired that the Roman people should for a time have their noses rubbed in anarchy under Mazzini that they might eventually appreciate

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Hales, \textit{Pio Nono}, pp. 98-99.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Times, February 20, 1849.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Guardian, February 21, 1849.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Times, February 23, 1849.
\end{enumerate}
the government of Pius IX. The flight of the Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany only confirmed the British press in its antipathy to the revolutionists of Italy and its desire to see some form of intervention undertaken by the Catholic powers according to a determined plan of concerted action.

The tendency of the press, so evident in January, to repudiate the course of events on the Continent and withdraw in isolation was again evidenced in February by the *North British Review*, which philosophically stated that it was not really important that England have much influence nowadays. She will possess all that influence desirable for her, it said, if only she conducts her relations with wisdom, in a firm and friendly spirit.

A widespread renewal of interest in the Italian situation was generated in March, 1849, by the publication of Charles MacFarlane's book, *A Glance at Revolutionized Italy*, (2 vols., 1848). MacFarlane was a conservative of the Blackwood's variety—bitterly anti-liberal—and his observations on the Italian crisis appear to have had considerable influence at a time when press opinion was beginning to fluctuate and re-shape itself.

Mazzini and the Italian liberals were denounced by MacFarlane as the chief mischief makers and assailants of all good order and government. MacFarlane charged them with the destruction of trade and commerce, the abetting of anarchy, and the halting of every possible improvement in Italy. He considered them cowards and irresponsible sensualists—cold, selfish,
and irresolute, incapable of undertaking true, reasonable, and lasting reforms. The dream of a united Italy MacFarlane scorned as ridiculous. The guiding hand of Austria was seen as Italy's only hope.

If Mazzini and the liberals received MacFarlane's contempt, Pius IX received the full brunt of his condemnation. MacFarlane judged the Pope to have been highly wanting in political prudence, and for that reason partly responsible for Italy's troubles. Pius IX's good intentions were not found to excuse him from bearing some blame for the current "catastrophe." He had overreached himself and failed to carry out what his ambition proposed. MacFarlane's estimate of Pius IX, nevertheless, was less harsh than his execration of the pontifical government, whose abuses the author considered to be the underlying cause of the revolution. On the whole, MacFarlane saw no future for Italy except under strong administrative governments stripped of clerical influence.

The book was generally received with favor. Since it condemned both papacy and democracy, it had a good deal to recommend it in a basically conservative, Protestant England. The Quarterly Review appreciated MacFarlane's views on Italian liberalism and the recommendation of a torn Italy to the arms of a wise, benevolent Austria.\(^{39}\) On the liberal side, the Westminster Review believed that while the book was "calculated to mislead many," yet it adduced "facts enough to prove that the present Pope, in all matters relating to the Church, has shown himself to be as superstitious and exclusive as any of his predecessors."\(^{40}\) The review in Bentley's Miscellany

\(^{39}\) Quarterly Review, LXXXIV (March 1849), 501-548.

\(^{40}\) Westminster Review, LI (April 1849), 189.
was inconclusive and declared for neither side in the Italian struggle. Tait's found the book somewhat to its liking, and took the occasion of a review to revise some of its own earlier judgments on Italy. It no longer, as it had once done, attributed the revolution in Italy to Pius IX, but it now beheld the beginnings of the revolution in a long-ripening movement fostered by Italian refugees, poets, and writers. The fault of the revolution, Tait's believed, was the unhealthy prevalence of socialists and communists among the radicals. Yet, despite that fact, not all the liberals were to be condemned, Tait's argued, for, mingled with the irresponsible revolutionists "were truly great men, who had lived through years of suffering at home or exile abroad, for the idea of freedom—men who really loved their respective countries, and were ready with any sacrifice for their independence." Allowance must be made, Tait's added, for the buffoonery of a certain lunatic fringe which should in no way obscure the noble qualities of the real patriots. Here, then, in the pages of Tait's, was the first solid indication of a case for the Roman Republic. Other journals reviewing MacFarlane's book included Fraser's, which held to its line of abhorrence for the Roman Republic, and the English Review, which, without diminishing its anti-papal ardor, showed itself uncertain on the political issues involved.

---

41 Bentley's Miscellany, XXV (1849), 319-320.
42 Tait's, n.s. XVI (March 1849), 184-193.
43 Ibid., pp. 184, 189.
44 Ibid., p. 187.
In the daily press, the situation at Rome was overshadowed for a time by speculation on the negotiations at Gaeta and the renewal of hostilities in Lombardy by Sardinia. The Guardian considered the deliberate and circumspect manner in which the Great Powers were undertaking their task "highly creditable to the care and caution, the discreet habits, and pacific tendencies of our times." The whole press was in common accord that the British government should maintain a firm "hands-off" policy in regard to the restoration.

On March 12, 1849, Sardinia broke the armistice established with Austria after Custozza in the preceding summer and went to war a second time. For Sardinia, the renewal of hostilities was disastrous. Within eleven days Radetsky crushed the invasion and administered a decisive defeat to the Piedmontese forces at Novara. The renewal of the war and the swift victory of the Austrians were extremely damaging blows to the already injured reputation of the Italian liberals. In the House of Lords the Earl of Aberdeen made a lengthy attack upon the perfidy of the Sardinian government. Tait's called Charles Albert "the stupid king of Sardinia."

---

46 A good study of the diplomatic negotiations at Gaeta may be found in F. Engel-Janosi, "The Return of Pius IX in 1850," Catholic Historical Review, XXXVI (July 1950), 129-162.

47 Guardian, March 7, 1849.

48 That Palmerston shared this view is clear from a dispatch to Lord Normanby, British Ambassador at Paris, March 27, 1849: "While not desirous of taking part in any action, the British government will be gratified if the result of the negotiations should be a reconciliation between pope and subjects so that he might return to his capital to resume his spiritual
Blackwood's named him "an intriguing Italian potentate," and was fairly jubilant over the Austrian success. 51 The Times, on three successive days, printed editorials hailing the victory of Radetsky. 52 Admiration for the brilliant efficiency of this octogenarian commander was practically unbounded.

In early April, the prestige of the Roman Republic in the British press was at a new low as it was made to share in the guilt and humiliation of Sardinia. 53 Then, too, reports of atrocities at Rome and anarchy in the Papal States were receiving wide publication. 54 The Pope at Gaeta, on the other hand, was receiving very little coverage, and there was almost no indication that the proposed intervention by the Catholic Powers was not shaping up according to all previous expectations. The French and Austrians, as the Times said, are not to be feared in this joint endeavor.

The French Republic cannot be reasonably or rightfully suspected of any intention of restoring the abuses of the old ecclesiastical government of the Popes.... The real desire of Austria and France can only be to render the experiment of constitutional liberty possible in Italy, by supplying the Governments with that force to resist the absurdity and extravagance of the populace and its demagogues which their own troops and the energy of the middle classes have not hitherto afforded. 55

There is hardly to be found anywhere a more clear and precise statement of the hopes of the greater portion of the press as regards the restoration of functions and temporal authority." Quoted in the English Review, XII (December 1849), 376.

49 Times, March 22, 1849.
50 Tait's, n.s. XVI (March 1849), 267.
51 Blackwood's, LXV (March 1849), 357.
Pius IX, but not through foreign intervention. Interference from foreign sources would only aggravate an already bitter situation, wrote the Edinburgh Review. Intervention was police work, the writer said; it might stop a riot, but not a revolution. The writer believed that were the Pope, whose Christian feelings had made him forswear a war, to return to the Vatican "over the dead bodies of his subjects," he would shame all Christendom in the act. Let him wait and bide his time; he might then regain peacefully a power which, the writer continued, it must be admitted he had not abused. 56 Thus the Edinburgh Review, in urging this hopeful waiting upon the Pope, implicitly revealed that it was as yet unaware how wide was the breach between the Roman Republic and Pius IX.

France shattered the English hope for a concerted intervention by dispatching a lone expeditionary force to Civita Vecchia on April 20, 1849. The force, consisting of about 9,000 troops, landed unopposed on April 25 and wasted five days before advancing on Rome. Those days were critical, for they allowed Garibaldi to receive sizeable reinforcements from the provinces, eventually making the French task all the more difficult. The first French attempt to take and enter Rome was repulsed by the Italians, who, in the fighting took 300-400 French prisoners. 57

---

52 Times, March 31, April 1 and 2, 1849.
53 Ibid., April 6, 1849.
54 See letters in the Guardian, April 18, 1849, and in the Times, April 9 and 12, 1849.
55 Times, April 19, 1849.
56 Edinburgh Review, LXXXIX (April 1849), 553.
The hope of the English press that Pius IX would return to his capital as a constitutional monarch received an equally smashing blow on April 20, the same day on which the French made a move to intervene on a lone-wolf basis. Pius IX issued on that day an allocution, Quibus Quantisque, in which he detailed the outrages inflicted upon himself and the Church, denounced the Roman Republic, and repudiated the idea of a conditional, constitutional restoration. The allocution did not offer any suggestions as to what guarantees would be established against the reinstitution of the former abuses of the pontifical government. Apparently Pius felt his own personality was sufficient guarantee for the restored papal government, for as he told the Duc d'Harcourt, who wanted him to promise the Romans free institutions, "Soyez tranquille! Pie neuf restera Pie neuf."—which is to say: generous, sympathetic, and benevolent, but not liberal.

The French action left the British press perplexed and annoyed. The French government was partly to blame for this confusion because the purpose of the French intervention at Rome was left somewhat up in the air. The over-cautious Louis Napoleon would not commit himself to a definite statement. At one time, the purpose was said to be simply the restoration of the Pope, or, again, the restoration of the Pope with constitutional guarantees, or yet again, the maintenance of legitimate French influence in Italy. This

57 Hales, Pio Nono, p. 118. The British government took no action against the French move and accepted the French assurances without embarrassing questions so as not to weaken the government of the Second Republic. So said Prime Minister John Russell in Parliament, July 20, 1849. Hansard's, 3rd series, CVII, 706.

58 Hales, Pio Nono, p. 117.
ambiguity, together with the loss of prestige in the first encounter at Rome, put the French in a bad way with the British press. They found very few defenders, even on the conservative side. The Times considered the ambiguity of the French position dangerous and expressed its wish that the real object of the expedition be laid squarely in the open. As it is now, the Times said, everyone is confused except the Mazzinians, who well realize their danger. 60 Tait's, which was now leaning rather strongly to the side of the Italian liberals, called the French action "one of the most deplorable blunders a republic could ever make." It termed the attack of France upon the Roman Republic unnatural—a kind of fratricide. 61 This simile and suggestion of an internecine struggle caught on in the ensuing months with a number of journals and had a definite influence in keeping a part of press opinion hostile to France.

The First Italian victory over the French surprised and astonished many.62 They had been led to believe that the Italians would rapidly collapse before a determined show of force. The refusal of the Italian defenders to dissolve like a mist before sunshine led editors to take a second glance and form new estimates of the strength of the Roman Republic. The change was somewhat slow in starting, but it gathered momentum rather steadily in the next few months. The press began to show a new respect for

59Ibid., p. 118.
60Times, May 11, 1849.
61Tait's, n.s. XVI (April 1849), 332.
62Guardian, May 16, 1849; Times, May 16, 1849; Tait's, n.s. XVI (June 1849), 402.
the republic, though it was a long time, and at a point not within the scope of this paper, before the British press swung fully around to give the Italian liberals its support.

At this time, however, the Roman Republic found one of its strongest, but not most influential, supporters in Lord Beaumont, a Catholic and an ultra-liberal, who made a spirited defence of the republic in the House of Lords, May 14, 1849. He commenced his speech by condemning the French intervention and reciting the former evils of the Papal States. The portrait he drew of Pius IX was most unfavorable. Pius was made to appear as unwise, imprudent, and always concerned for the absolute maintenance of his supreme authority. Beaumont called the constitution granted in March, 1848, a "phantom of a constitution" extracted against the papal will. Pius, he charged, intended to retract all concessions at the earliest feasible opportunity. He further charged that Pius had taken Rossi as his prime minister only after considerable pressure was brought to bear by foreign powers, and that the two men did not see eye to eye on liberal reforms. Although some persons in Italy rejoiced at Rossi's murder, Beaumont continued, not one of them was found among the persons who came to power after his death. Having challenged the popular impression thus boldly, Beaumont went on to justify the acts of the revolution, stating that the people rose up only in indignation against an attempted reaction by the Cardinals. Pius need not have fled, he said, for he was in no danger of his life, but

63 Miles Thomas Stapleton, 8th Baron Beaumont, entered the House of Lords in 1840. Beyond speaking up at this time for the Roman Republic, he seems not to have attained any prominence in political life.

64 Hansard's, 3rd series, CV, 365-389.
whether he went or stayed was a matter of no concern to the Romans.

At this point in the speech, Beaumont accused Lord Henry Brougham of asserting falsehoods about the Italian republic. After a sharp exchange of words between the two lords, the debate continued, Beaumont defending, and Brougham attacking the Roman Republic.

Reacting to this speech by Beaumont, the Times clarified its own stand on the affairs of Rome. It began to hedge a bit in its enthusiasm for Pius IX and assured its readers that:

We are not solicitous for the restoration of Papal authority,...but our repugnance to Monsignori and Swiss Halberdiers does not diminish our distaste for the insane diatribes of Mazzini and the foreign freebooters of Garibaldi's legion, inflated as they now are by their unlooked for victories. Whatever be thought of Papal Government, these men are clearly known and marked out as the most daring leaders of Italian conspiracy. They are enthusiasts and adventurers, whose triumph is the triumph of the cause which still threatens Europe with devastation.65

The Times considered Beaumont's speech "an unmanly and illiberal attack on the memory of the most illustrious victim of Italian constitutional freedom."66 It abhorred the excuses found to defend the "miscreants who destroyed him." It looked to see the Pope restored to his throne and hoped that he would promote the prosperity and independence of Italy by establishing free municipal governments and entering into a league of Italian states.

65 Times, May 16, 1849.
66 Ibid. Remarking on Beaumont's rejoicing at the downfall of the temporal power of the papacy, the Times called it one of the "singularities of these times," but one which it noted with "satisfaction." Ibid.
67 Ibid.
On the whole, the case for Pius IX was taken up principally along the negative line of opposing the democratic party of Mazzini, who was generally regarded—unjustly, as Hales says—as a reincarnation of Robespierre. No one can deny the real intensity of the British reaction to the disorder and anarchy generated by the upheavals of 1848, but the question was not so much what one was for as what one was against. In the case of Pius IX, the British press found very little to be for, because though they showed a still active affection for the "liberal" Pope, they were unceasingly opposed to the realities he represented. Those who took the side of the Pope liked him, but not the papacy nor the papal government. It is not too much to surmise in this case that they would conceivably been quite pleased had the temporal power of the papacy been lost to a more 'orderly' and moderately liberal group than Mazzini's. But grand person though he may have appeared to be in the British press, Pius IX was always basically, in 1849, the lesser of two evils. He never engaged the press on the side of the things he stood for. Consequently, if the choice were between Pius IX and Mazzini, Pius would win easily (at least before 1850), but when it came to a choice between papal government and the liberal experiment, the choice would have gone the other way. The factors which, up to April, 1849, carried public and press opinion in favor of the papal government were the hope men had in Pius IX and the fear they had of "democracy." Therefore, given those conditions, one can understand how easily press opinion might swing over to the liberal side if confidence in Pius IX were severely

68 Hales, Pio Nono, p. 130.
shaken, and if the Italian revolutionists were shown to be more sensible, responsible, and courageous than formerly represented. The months of May-July, 1849, are, for that reason, highly important because the possibilities became realities and resulted in a re-shaping of press and public opinion toward the Italian revolution. The full effects of this change were apparent only in the following years.

The initial stages of the change seem to have been marked more by the adoption of a new attitude toward Pius IX than toward the Roman Republic. The Times continued to hammer away at the revolutionists, and the Quarterly Review took a whacking 34-page slap at Lord Beaumont for his defence of the Italians. The fact of greatest interest in this latter article, however, is that while the Quarterly Review termed Beaumont's partisan account of the events at Rome "inaccurate," its own account was even more damaging to the reputation of Pius IX. The writer believed that:

...the faults and inconsistencies of Pius were not, as he represents, the consequences of a priestly and despotic government; they were the necessary faults of a weak prince, coerced in his conduct, and tormented by his conscience; they were not the faults of an absolute sovereign, and, in fact, could not have been committed by one: they were the faults into which a very limited one was led by pursuing the policy of "his liberal and enlightened advisers." 70

The principal fault of Pius IX, the writer went on, was this, that he did not guard his own interests, i.e. the Church and the papal institutions. His conduct was said to have been marked by deplorable weakness, "especially

69 "Lord Beaumont on Foreign Policy," Quarterly Review, LXXXV (June 1849), 225-259.
70 Ibid., p. 230.
a mean thirst for popularity." To obtain it he had been willing to sacrifice his true interests. Thus, all in all, the sentiment of the Quarterly Review as regards the Italian situation was clearly that of "a plague on both your houses," for, as it remarked in the same article: "if we despise him, we abhor the villany and treachery by which he was undermined." Yet the writer was realist enough to recognize that if Pius IX were to be restored in any permanent fashion, he must be given his former power without distinction as to what is temporal and what is spiritual. In advocating that move, the review stated, it acted not for the papacy, but for the preservation of peace and the protection of morality as against the dissemination of violence and anarchy.

In May and June, 1849, the foreign correspondents for British newspapers were more often at Rome, where the fighting was taking place, than at Gaeta, where negotiations for the restoration were still in progress. The reports from Rome were consistently favorable to the republic. Those of the Times' correspondent were an exception. The support for Mazzini was on the rise. The Roman Republic, said the North British Review, "seems to be acting with a wisdom and a firmness, a discretion and a vigour that are well fitted to call forth admiration and sympathy." Exeter Hall hailed and supported Mazzini with uncritical enthusiasm.

---

71 Ibid., pp. 230-231.
72 Ibid., p. 231.
73 Ibid., pp. 255-256.
74 Such was the charge of the Quarterly Review, which implied that the correspondents were being intimidated by the revolutionists and fettered by
In May Austrian troops entered the Papal States from the north and began to roll down the Romagna and the Marches, restoring order as they went. An attempt by the French to negotiate an entry into Rome failed, and with an anxious eye upon the Austrian advance, the French forces were left with no alternative but to assault and carry the city as swiftly as possible if they wished to retain a free hand at Rome. Supplied with strong reinforcements, the French army began the assault on June 3, 1849. After a month of bitter fighting, the French finally carried the city, and Garibaldi, with his legionaires, withdrew to the north. 77

The victory, so long delayed, cost both the French and the Pope a loss of prestige in the British press. The stiff Italian resistance had been wholly unexpected. The Guardian reluctantly expressed its admiration for the "very gallant defense" made by the defenders of the Roman Republic. In the ensuing months, this admiration was to grow as tales of the defense, both true and fictional, received wider publicity. The theme of fratricide, first used by Tait's, was popularized by Punch and the Guardian to characterize the French assault and victory. 78

75North British Review, XI (May 1849), 273.
76Punch, XVI (May 26, 1849), 213.
77Hales, Pio Nono, pp. 118-119.
78Guardian, June 27, 1849.
The resistance of the Italians raised the question of whether the people of Rome were as anxious for the restoration of Pius IX as reports had indicated from January-April, 1849. Where, asked the Times correspondent, was that party of papal partisans so long thought to be straining at the leash? The Catholic powers, he feared, had been acting on false data; they had confused Rome's love for Pio Nono with their hatred of papal government. The first, he said, they will accept, but not the second. He was convinced that papal government could not be restored to Rome.80

The Guardian noted that the consensus among correspondents of London newspapers was that the Roman people had a strong repugnance to the re-establishment of clerical government.81

Faced with this reaction on the part of the Roman people, the British press abandoned its previous view that the rule of Mazzini had been a tenuous thing "trembling to its fall." Instead the Pope now came in for condemnation by the liberal journals as a ruler marching back to his throne through the blood and carcasses of his subjects.

79 Ibid., June 6, 1849; Punch, XVI (June 23, 1849), 250.
80 Times, June 16, 1849.
81 Guardian, June 13, 1849.
CHAPTER V

THE RESTORATION: June 1849-April 1850

It seems that the first reaction in the greater part of the English press to the fall of the Roman Republic was one of momentary confusion. This was not true, of course, of newspapers like the Daily News nor of periodicals like Tait's, which had already committed themselves to supporting the Italian revolution. As yet, however, the organs of the press giving unqualified or enthusiastic support to the Italian liberals were in the minority. Their number did not include any of the large circulation newspapers or reviews such as the Times, the Quarterly Review, the Edinburgh Review, or Punch. As Punch put it, they could applaud neither the Pope's overthrow nor the Roman revolution. Neither could they advance a censure against France, whose object in the affair was the restoration of order. Thus, commented Punch, it was a case of "politics" against "persuasion," i.e. a distaste for revolution versus a dislike for popery. "So we're forced to be mum."¹

It did not take the press long to extricate itself from this predicament. A number of factors contributed to turning a great part of public and press opinion somewhat in favor of the Italians. In the summer of 1849, Austria had just finished crushing the Hungarian revolt begun in March of

¹Punch, XVI (June 30, 1849), 259.

101
the same year. The fighting had been brutal on both sides, but the Hungarian exiles who fled to England won the ears and hearts of the English people with tales of atrocities and of the public flogging of women by the Austrian troops. The country was swept with a pro-Hungarian fever as sympathy meetings were held in town after town throughout July and August.  

The anti-Austrian feeling which these meetings and speeches engendered profited the Italians in an indirect, but very concrete fashion. Then, too, a number of popular writers and poets of the day began to write in defence of the Roman Republic and its partisans. Among them were Leigh Hunt, Arthur Hugh Clough, Charles Dickens, and Walter Savage Landor. No spokesmen such as these arose to take the papal side. The Dublin Review was very noticeably quiet on the issue of the Pope, as it had been from 1846 on. It gave no space to a presentation of the Pope's case. Prominent Catholics in Parliament, instead of defending the Pope, were among the foremost protectors of the Italian refugees. Lord Beaumont and Chisholm Anstey were leading supporters of the Italian Refugee Fund, which also claimed the support of Dickens, Richard Cobden, W. S. Landor, Douglas Jerrold, W. M. Thackeray, and other leading men of London's and England's influential

\[2\] Tait's, n.s. XVI (September, 1849), 602.

\[3\] Rudman, pp. 86-88.

\[4\] Thomas Chisholm Anstey, M. P. for Youghal, Ireland, had been converted to Catholicism in 1833. He was a staunch advocate for the rights of Catholics, but it appears that he was not too popular with his fellow members in Parliament. His constant efforts for Catholic relief were rewarded in 1847 by Pius IX, who conferred upon him the Knighthood of Saint Gregory. G. Elliot Anstruther, A Hundred Years of Catholic Progress (London, 1929), p. 45.
classes. As more and more of the Roman exiles took refuge in England, they won a hearing for their side by lecturing anywhere and everywhere, telling of the evils of the papal government and of the perfidy of the Pope. All in all, the Italian cause found a militant and vocal body of adherents to carry its banner before the English people and the press.

The leading officers of the British government were not untouched by the rising enthusiasm for the Italians. Lord Russell and Lord Minto had for long been partisans of the Italian liberals, though their enthusiasm and support was taken back somewhat at the time of the Roman Republic. Palmerston was convinced that Rome would sooner or later become a republic. He believed that the papal supremacy, "both spiritual and temporal, has received an earthquake shake from which it can never recover.... There will be shock after shock, till it all crumbles to the ground." Palmerston found additional reason for lending support to the Italian cause in the resemblance he saw between the Roman Republic and the Protestant Reformation. Both contained a move for greater liberty in the throwing off of the chains of papal dominion. But these were private views, and in public the government made no move to interfere with the restoration of Pius IX at Rome.

Nevertheless, Palmerston did believe that it was impossible for the

---

5 See the public advertisement of the Fund on the front page of the Times, September 19, 1849. The subscriptions as of that date amounted to £219-9-6.

6 Hales, Pio Nono, pp. 142-143.

7 Ashley, I, 126.

8 Ibid., pp. 126-127.
Pope to return to Rome unconditionally. He wanted the Pope to confirm the Constitution of 1848 as a guarantee of liberal government. The loss of temporal authority which that concession would entail for Pius IX did not disturb the Foreign Secretary. Such a curtailment of papal power would be a good thing, he felt, if it led eventually to greater localization and nationalization of the Catholic Church. He wrote that it would be "a great point gained..., a material step in the progress of human society."9

The fall of Rome to the French occasioned several days discussion in the House of Lords. On July 19 Lord Malmesbury brought up the subject of Mr. Freeborn, the British consul at Rome, who had indiscriminately issued passports to the Italian refugees. The action was unusual and quite improper, the lord said, and very likely to bring English passports into disrepute. If the lives of the exiles had been in danger, Malmesbury continued, it would have been another matter, but that did not seem to him to have been the case.10 Lord Lansdowne defended Freeborn on the supposition that obviously the lives of the refugees were in danger or the consul would not have acted as he did. This answer failed to satisfy Malmesbury who thought that Freeborn was simply a rather nervous person who had panicked.11

The following day Lord Brougham delivered a speech in defence of the French action restoring the Pope. His fundamental argument was that the restoration of the Pope to his temporal authority was necessary to the peace of

9 Ibid., pp. 121-122.
10 Hansard's, 3rd series, CVII, 557.
11 Ibid., pp. 558-559.
Europe. Possessing as much influence as he does, said Brougham, the Pope must be independent of the control of any power. It is a piece of quibbling, he went on, to distinguish between the spiritual and temporal authorities and say that England would wish the first restored, but not the second. Such a view he considered shortsighted and superficial. The independence of the spiritual power, he observed, ultimately depends on the independence of the temporal power. 12 The Earl of Carlisle spoke of Her Majesty's government as "sympathizing deeply with the Pope" and fully alive to the troubles of the Roman States. 13 Lord Lansdowne assured Brougham that the views he expressed were shared by the government, which "had a deep interest in seeing the Pope exercise his spiritual authority unfettered by any temporal influence." 14 The same statement of policy had been previously expressed by Lansdowne in the House of Lords on June 12, 1849. 15

The Times succinctly summed up the debate with the observation that though they disliked the means employed, both the ministers and the opposition in the House of Lords acquiesced in the object of the French expedition, namely, the restoration of the Pope. 16

The Times, treating of the fall of Rome in several editorials, found the French military showing unimpressive, but that was a matter of minor importance. The principal problem with which the Times was concerned was

12 Ibid., p. 627.
13 Ibid., p. 645. Later in his speech Carlisle added that neither could he withhold his "sympathy from the heroic efforts of the defenders."
14 Ibid., p. 707.
15 Ibid., CVI, 9.
the use which the French proposed to make of their position. Now that France has taken Rome, said the Times, she is in a blind alley. The Times asked France to clarify her position and issue a declaration of purpose telling whether or not it would seek the restoration of the Pope with or without guarantees of reform. For the time being, the Times gave the French the benefit of the doubt that her purpose was a conditional restoration, taking the liberal concessions of 1848 as the basis of the secular administration. But, it asked, has the consent of Pius IX to these conditions been obtained? The Pope, it feared, was going to reject any restrictions and fall back upon Austria, Naples, and Spain for his support.\footnote{16}{The Times, July 23, 1849.}

The Times, like Palmerston, was certain that a restoration of the papal government without some guarantees of future reform was quite out of the question. That government, it commented, "must of necessity undergo some salutary change" if it is to maintain its existence. The presence of a corrupt papal government, it concluded, is as much out of place in Italy as was Mazzini's republic.\footnote{17}{Ibid., July 5, 1849. Also July 10, 1849.} So certain of its position was the Times that it confidently looked upon the French control of Rome as a kind of insurmountable obstacle to the unconditional restoration of papal government.

The Guardian was delighted with the downfall of the Republic, though it, too, considered the expedition discrediting and embarrassing to the French. As for the return of the Pope, the Guardian thought it highly

\footnote{18}{Ibid., July 5, 1849.}
doubtful that, left to their own choice, the people of Rome would have
recalled Pius IX. "Any pretended appeal to the popular will would, of
course, be a ridiculous farce," it observed caustically. With slightly
more confidence than the Times, the Guardian judged that the most likely
prospect at Rome was a restoration of the Pope with constitutional guaran­
tees for the people. 19

Sympathy for the Italian revolutionists picked up during July after
the fall of Rome. The Daily News, Tait's, and the Illustrated London News
gave them a consistently good press throughout the months of the war. 20

By July, dissatisfaction with the French expedition led the Westminster
Review to a softer viewpoint on the defeated republic. 21 Punch, a week
after it confessed confusion over the Roman situation, took its stand
squarely against the French and with the republic. It called General
Oudinot, commanding the French forces at Rome, a French cockatrice hatching
a reptile in the Eternal City. 22 On July 14 Punch printed a "Congratulations
Ode to the French on Their Triumph at Rome." Without attacking Pius
IX, it excoriated Oudinot and the Second Republic and hailed the defenders
of Rome as "stronger in cause— in justice and in right—" and as "Freedom's
living warriors." Among the more bitter and scorching lines of the "Ode"
were the following:

19 Guardian, July 11, 1849.
20 Rudman, p. 87.
21 Westminster Review, LI (July 1849), 478.
22 Punch, XVII (July 7, 1849), 9.
You should exult, then, o'er the prostrate Free;  
Yes, ye should glory o'er the vanquished Brave,  
As might the victors at Thermopylae  
Have held their orgies on the Spartans' grave.

Come, sing aloud the Marseillaise with glee,  
For tyranny by Frenchmen's aid restored;  
Raise ye the strain, "Mourir pour la patrie,"  
On having smitten patriots with the sword:  
Come, ye sincere republicans of France  
Come forth, whilst crackers bounce and cannons boom,  
Around your Trees of Liberty to dance,  
And trample on the liberty of Rome.  

The Roman Republic found as forceful—and far more eloquent—a sympathizer in Sharpe's London Magazine. Until July, 1849, it had never printed a word of comment on Italian affairs, but in July Sharpe's carried a beautifully written article which served as an appeal for sympathy with the Italian revolutionists. Much of the article was propaganda—but extremely well done. "The glorious struggle of the Romans, in defence of their civil and moral liberty and their social rights... is for the present, at an end," the writer began. Yet might cannot conquer the principle of right, he continued,

and, in the eyes of the dispassionate, the liberal, and the just, the Romans, even subjugated as they are once more under an odious and degrading yoke, have more claim to respect for the brave though unsuccessful efforts they have made to free themselves from it; than have Oudinot and his myrmidons... for their unjustifiable attack upon a people who had neither injured nor offended them, and who, at any rate, were only acting upon the principles of which they had themselves given the example.

23 Ibid., XVII (July 14, 1849), 21.
24 "Rome," Sharpe's London Magazine, X (July 1849), 170-177. This journal, intended for general reading and entertainment, carried very few articles on political matters. Its pages, however, seem to have been open
The writer knew how to use emotion-packed phraseology, and he knew to what people he was appealing. Therefore, in reciting a list of the abuses of the papal government, he concentrated on the defects in education, in freedom of the press, in trade and commerce, but above all in the administration of justice. The early days of Pius IX were portrayed as times of inconceivable bliss when Italians learned to stand and fight the Austrians. Hundreds of gallant youths, the writer declared, left the pleasures of home "to take their mother earth for their resting place, the blue vault of the heavens above them for their canopy." 26

With their new-found freedom, the article went on, the Italians began to read, even the Bible—"horror of horrors to the priests." They began to laugh at Austria and question her power, and at Rome they learned to trample on the Austrian Eagle. At the moment of trial in March, 1848, the people and the Pope began to draw apart; "the Pope felt that he could no longer rely on the affection of his people, because he was conscious of not deserving it." 27

The attack upon the Quirinal November 16, 1848, the day after Rossi's assassination, the writer passed off as having been a peaceful procession momentarily thrown into confusion by the chance misfiring of the musket of a civic guard. Such was the affair, the writer urged, "which was magnified to the enthusiasts for the resorgimento.

25 Ibid., p. 170.
26 Ibid., p. 172.
27 Ibid., p. 173.
by the alarmists, and misrepresented accordingly by the English journals, into a desperate and bloodthirsty attempt on the part of the people to massacre the Pope in his own palace."  

As for the tales of murder and violence circulating about the Republic, why, the writer claimed, there was less crime in the days of the republic than existed for many years before it. Taxes were modified, the tariff revised, and abuses of charity corrected. "The regulations made by the government for the comfort and welfare of the inhabitants were of the wisest and most parental kind." Everywhere was order, prayer, and religion. "Rome never presented a more truly religious and orderly aspect than when it was represented in some of the English journals as the seat of anarchy, impiety, and bloodshed."  

In the siege of Rome, the writer said, "the conduct of the Romans, so far as we could judge of it, ... was ... in every respect, admirable and just, and as such entitled to the approbation and sympathy of every free and generous people." In a final paragraph, the writer made an open appeal for the Italian refugees. Where now, he asked, can they look for a home "but among the brave and the free?...I wish to avoid politics and personalities, and only to plead the cause of the unfortunate, in the name of Humanity and Truth."  

This well-composed amalgam of half-truths, fiction, and sentimental
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28 Ibid., p. 174.  
29 Ibid., p. 175.  
30 Ibid., pp. 176-177.
appeals undoubtedly had its effect, but the facts of the case had not yet convinced the Edinburgh Review of the harmlessness of republicanism. As agents for republicanism in Italy, the Review stated, Mazzini and his followers had done "infinite mischief to the cause of national independence and constitutional liberty over the Continent." On them it fixed the responsibility "for the ruin of Italy in its recent struggle."

In July, 1849, the British government published the Correspondence Respecting the Affairs of Italy: June 1846-December 1847, and the Times took the opportunity to reminisce about the hopes of those early days. It looked back to those "unclouded" times with an evident nostalgia, nor did it feel that anyone who was swept up with enthusiasm then had to apologize now. No harsh judgment, it said, is to be passed on those who were dazzled till they overlooked the precipice at their feet. Only two men, the Times reflected, realized that the program of reform in Italy was not to stop at moderate levels—Metternich and Mazzini. The one feared, the other hoped, while British statesmen maintained that everything was to be had by concession. England, the Times concluded, must suffer remorse for having helped to plunge Italy into her calamities.

During the latter half of the month of July, the attention of the Times was fixed on the problem of a conditional or unconditional restoration of the Pope. The Roman correspondent of the Times urged two points: first, that the Roman States be guaranteed their neutrality, and second, that the
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people of the Roman States be guaranteed a constitutional government based upon the separation of the temporal and spiritual powers. He called upon the Times to "come forward with all its strength to struggle against despotism, as it has hitherto fought and conquered the Republican faction in every part of Italy. We shall now be understood, and the Roman people shall at length see that, so far as the power of public opinion goes, they shall be protected from Church government and the fatal domination of the Cardinals." 33

For the next few days, the Roman correspondent took a softer tone where the Pope was concerned, but he maintained a steady attitude of opposition toward the restoration of clerical government at Rome. Regarding the Pope himself, the reports conflicted. At one moment he was supposedly in favor of guaranteeing a constitution, but was being opposed by the Cardinals. At another time he was reported to be demanding unconditional restoration. 34 The confusion as to what the mind of the Pope actually was lasted for quite some time.

On July 31, 1849, the commander of the French forces at Rome handed over the government of the city to a commission of three cardinals appointed by Pius IX to rule until his return. 35 The commission was not popular
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33 Ibid.
34 The confusion is evident in the reports of the Times for July 19, 21, 23, 26, 27, August 1 and 8.
35 Cardinals Della Genga, Vannicelli, and Alteri. Della Genga was known as an administrator with reactionary tendencies. Because the ruling body in the Roman Republic was a triumvirate, the commission of the three cardinals was soon known as the Red Triumvirate. Hales, Pio Nono, p. 120.
either with the Roman people or with the British press, and for basically similar reasons. The cardinals, however just they may have been, were a symbol of clerical government, and the British press and the Romans had for some time been expressing their antagonism to that form of rule. With the British press, opposition to clerical government was based both on principle and on fact. The backwardness of the Papal States under Leo XII and Gregory XVI gave sufficient evidence of the inefficiency and, to some extent, corruption of the papal government. The British, devoted as they were to order, efficiency, godliness and morality had cause enough to condemn clerical government on the record of its operation, but more importantly, the British press was practically of one mind in believing that secular and ecclesiastical power must be separated and kept distinct as a matter of principle. It had expressed this view in its previous discussions of the fate of Pius IX's temporal power, and even though many responsible men now considered the restoration of the temporal power necessary for the peace of Europe, they did not hold the same view on the restoration of clerical government. They did not fully see the problem from the Pope's point of view; they were too often inclined to view his problems in the light of the British experience with Church-State relationships. Hence, they adopted an a priori conviction that the best solution to the Roman question was a compromise whereby Pius IX would guarantee the civil liberties of his subjects, including some form of representational government, and yet remain in full and independent control of his state. The British press was not prepared, however, to offer concrete suggestions as to how the delicate balance between authority and liberty in the Papal States might be achieved. The
most that can be said is that it simply had faith that the thing could be done.

Reacting to the establishment of the commission, the Times called it the "sin of the Roman expedition." The first acts of the Red Triumvirate were judged "injudicious," and the triumvirate was named a "ludicrous caricature" of the triumvirate of the Republic. The evident disappointment of the Times was portrayed in the bitterness of its editorials on two successive days, August 14 and 15. The actions and language of the cardinals, it said, "have hitherto been marked by the stupidity and insincerity of a power utterly incompetent to meet the necessities of its position." The commission was "a revival of the most contemptible usage of the Papal administration." There is no doubt, the Times said, that the better part of the Romans were disgusted by the violence of November, 1848, which overthrew "the best experiment Rome ever witnessed," but if they had to choose between the extremes of clerical government and a democratic republic, surely they would choose the latter. The Times could "conceive nothing more odious" than that the papal power "should show itself more arbitrary, implacable and unjust than the dictators of a revolution." If this is to be the conduct of the court of Rome, it asserted,

we venture to affirm that the most hostile measures of Mazzini and his associates will have proved less fatal
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to its security and power than the foolish and intolerant actions of its own representatives... If Pius IX has not sufficient independence of judgment and vigour of character to distinguish the just rights which he may uphold from the gross delusions which have almost buried the Papacy under their ruins, his infatuation will give a deathblow to his power. 40

Nothing could please the enemies of the papacy more, continued the Times, than to see it so incorrigible, and though it sought to speak well of Pius IX, the Times found "nothing in the present policy and intentions of the Pope...to disappoint the predictions of his bitterest enemies." 41

The Times therefore challenged France to fulfill her promise and insure that the full restoration of the Pope be accompanied by a thorough reform of the administration of the Papal States and by rational concessions to the people. France has this obligation, said the Times, and the means to fulfill it. Let her only keep faith with herself, with Rome and with the best interests of the papacy. 42

In late August, 1849, Punch observed that public opinion was now marshalling itself behind Hungary and Rome. The defenders of the liberals no longer had to hold out apologies for their position; instead they now found themselves gaining active support from new quarters. "Our silence," cried Punch, "has been to us a passing shame. We have all too carelessly opened ourselves to the charge of national treachery." For a while, the writer continued, England stood like a trimming teacher, reluctant to

40 Ibid.
41 Ibid.
42 Ibid., August 14, 1849.
recognize her own teachings, but now, Punch declared, "we have cast away this passing shame." Opinion favoring the revolutionists increases daily, it said, and "in due season, it must triumph." And triumph it did with the North British Review, which, in August, 1849, became a kind of Lord Protector to the Roman Republic. The writer offered no discussion of issues, persons, or events. For him, the struggle between the republic and the papacy was simply one of liberty versus despotism.

When, on August 20, 1849, the Times finally concluded that the acts of Pius IX were the results of his own decisions and not merely those of his advisers, it turned on him with a vengeance. It charged the Pope with having had for quite some time the intention of restoring "those traditional principles of administration which have hitherto so equivocally characterized the states of the Church." Some reaction, it went on, might have been expected after the eruption of November, 1848, but it now seems that even before that date Pius IX had wished to restore the full system of abuses of an essentially corrupt administration. Hence, the Times, like many others, was beginning to feel that the Romans had more justification for making their revolution than had appeared in 1848. The current measures of Pius IX, said the Times, have dispelled the illusion that the acts of the Republic were not those of the people. The only consolation which the Times could find in the situation was its persuasion that Pius IX, no matter how determined, could not restore his despotism to its former limits. If left
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unsupported by foreign bayonets, it believed, the people will soon teach him how far he may go, and if supported, he must inevitably bow to the direction of the nation supplying his protection. Whether that nation were France, Austria, or Naples, the *Times* was certain that none would support the claims of the Pope and cardinals.

For a while longer, the conservative element in the British press clung with tenacity to this belief that the action of the Catholic powers must certainly result in the imposing of restrictions upon Pius IX, whatever his own "pretensions" might be. The secularization of his administration, remarked the *Guardian*, was obviously indispensable. By September, however, one fact appeared clear to the whole British press, namely, that Pius IX was not, nor ever had been a Liberal Pope. As this conclusion came home to the various segments of the press, it evoked diverse degrees of bitterness and anger, seemingly in inverse proportion to the former enthusiasm and hope. The *Times*, as already noted, displayed its bitter disappointment. The *Guardian*, which had never allowed its enthusiasm to obscure its critical eye, reacted very mildly and almost in a matter-of-fact fashion. It had been prepared for disappointment by its previous line of caution. It had been among the first to notice the split between Pius and the liberals at the end of 1847.

The most violent reaction among the conservative journals was found in the *Quarterly Review*. In spite of the fact that this review had never
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looked with favor upon the course of reforms and concessions taken by Pius IX, it had usually retained some respect for his person and his personal qualities. While almost predicting that the path followed by the Pope would end in revolution and the loss of his temporal power, the Quarterly Review was careful to pay its respects to "the amiable and accomplished Pius IX." It was won by his personality and not by his reforms, which fact perhaps is the only explanation why its reaction consisted in an abusive attack on the personal character of the Pope. In an article appearing in September, 1849, the language of the writer was violent and extremely disrespectful. No person active in current events, the article noted, was less remarkable than Pius IX for "eminent qualities of any sort."

Like all feeble persons, he is frequently false, not because falsehood is congenial to his disposition, but because his temperament shrinks from the avowal of conviction. His weakness is gratified by cowardly and timeserving counsels. Uneasy in the presence of superior men, he naturally prefers mediocrity. Incapable of friendship, he falls easily under the dominion of low favourites, and is fond of being entertained with tales of gossip and the childish buffooneries that delight the vulgar. 47

He was, the writer continued, so whimsically particular in his tastes and eating habits and so devoted to them that neither business nor distress can wean him from them. In the midst of dangers, he said, neither sleep nor appetite deserted the Pope. He was so deficient in sensibility that "he actually grew fat in his humiliating retreat at Gaeta." "Under the present circumstances of difficulty," the writer concluded, "he has been the ruin of

47 "Rome," Quarterly Review, LXXV (September 1849), 583.
Rome and the papacy, and a scourge to Europe. "48 A more discrediting summary of the papal character could hardly have been written by the fiercest partisan of Mazzini.

In September, another article, similar to the first, appeared in Sharpe's in defence of the Roman Republic. 49 The French attack upon Rome was called "most unjustifiable." The imposition of martial law after the French victory, with a 9:30 P.M. curfew and a restriction of the press, was subtly metamorphosed by the writer into "tyranny." Nothing could be more harmless, the author said, than Roman citizens strolling along the streets in the balmy summer air, filling the night with melody and the favorite airs of some admired opera.

The writer, choosing his words as an artist chooses colors, recreated for his readers the dramatic scene of Garibaldi's last hours in Rome. The whole effect of the narrative was one of high drama shot through with courage and the strictest asceticism. For added force, the author included in his story a touching melodramatic description of the death of Garibaldi's wife. 51

The writer was undoubtedly an expert in using words to move the public. He employed his material deftly, building paragraph by paragraph to one final outburst appealing to Englishmen to befriend the refugees, those

48 Ibid., pp. 583-584.
49 "Rome in 1849," Sharpe's, X (September 1849), 238-244.
50 Ibid., pp. 238-239.
51 Ibid., pp. 239-240.
persecuted victims of despotism and idolatry. Stress was laid upon details most likely to horrify—and titillate—the imagination of a nineteenth century English gentleman or lady. The writer told of the "secret cells, the trapdoors, the mysterious niches" of the Inquisition prison, where "among the dust and scattered bones of the victims...were found rings, and fragments of female ornaments." The walls of the prison were purported to have been covered with inscriptions, of which one was in English: "Is this the Christian faith?" The writer was particularly touched by this "appeal of some lonely countrymen, incarcerated there, perhaps, for years; thinking of his own England, the sea-girt isle, proud and free, from which he was, too probably, separated for ever; possibly only for some unguarded expression, or, haply, for a noble adherence to the religion which he believed to be 'pure' and undefiled before God." Written with such skillful touches, the article was a masterful appeal, calculated to carry its effect.

By the autumn of 1849, public opinion in England was supremely indifferent to the fate of Pius IX. The facts of the restoration which it did not already know, it could well guess at, though one may well wonder whether the majority of Englishmen were even interested in doing that. The Times itself took on this attitude of indifference whenever it mentioned Pius IX or the restoration. In assuming this posture it adopted the technique of Punch and spoke of the Pope only in terms of light sarcasm and ridicule. At times the editorial writers even allowed themselves to be betrayed into unguarded phrases expressing admiration of the defenders of the Roman
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Republic—unguarded, because although the Times had lost its bet on Pius IX, it was a long way from supporting the revolutionists. When Dickens, in August, and Mazzini, in September, 1849, wrote letters to the newspapers of London and England in defence of the Roman Republic, the Times refused to print either one. 53

On September 12, 1849, Pius IX issued at Gaeta a motu proprio laying out the program of reforms and the system of government he proposed to establish for his dominions. The document provided for a Council of State to be consulted on legislative and important administrative matters, an Assembly for the supervision of finances, and diets in the provinces. These were strictly consultative bodies, whose members were chosen by the Pope or by co-option. Emphasis was given to municipal autonomy, and reforms were proposed for the fields of civil and commercial law, and public administration. The motu proprio also contained an announcement of an amnesty, which appeared in conjunction with the motu proprio. Compared with the amnesty of 1846, this one was rather severe in its provisions. 54

The reaction in England to this decree was practically nil, except in the conservative press. The Quarterly Review doubted that the provisions of the motu proprio would quiet the general disaffection. If the scheme is to succeed, it said, Pius IX must show a firmness he has not hitherto exhibited. 55

The Times' Roman correspondent considered the document a scrap of "waste-paper," but the Times' editors momentarily mitigated their
antagonism and reacted sympathetically. Part of the blame for the restrictions of the amnesty, they said, is due to the Italian liberals, who, by their excesses, caused the present sternness of the Pope. The Times was not altogether displeased with this papal severity. Too much lenity, it dryly observed, only encourages democrats and demagogues. The Guardian, for its part, was taken aback with the rigor of the restrictions in the amnesty. It would have preferred to see the Pope show more mercy to the delinquents. As for the motu proprio, the Guardian considered it a sham constitution and worse than none at all. It can awaken, it said, "no other feeling than disappointment and disgust."

Tait's was one of the few liberal magazines which commented on the motu proprio and the amnesty. Not surprisingly, it scorned both acts. The amnesty, it said, serves nothing but to pardon those who have no need of it and excepts all those who do.

Once the motu proprio more or less established the character of the restored papal government, interest in Pius IX dropped off rapidly. The position of the press at the end of September, 1849, remained relatively constant over the next seven months previous to the Pope's actual return to
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Rome in April, 1850. The attitude of the press during this interim never once swerved in his favor; rather, it tended to grow, if not more hostile, at least more cynical and contemptuous toward him. There were some here and there, however, who, though they condemned all of the papal acts, yet paid their respects to the person of Pius IX. For the most part, though, Pope and papacy were treated as one.

By late October, Punch was again advocating a militant celebration of Guy Fawkes Day and called upon Englishmen to hang a Guy Fawkes in every street, lane, court, and alley. The North British Review thrust at the Pope by questioning the right of the papacy to any temporal power, and the English Review, which had been silent on this topic since June, 1848, now placed itself definitely on the side of the Italian revolution, more, it seems, for reasons of anti-papal feelings than for any affection for Mazzini, whom it still despised. It went to great length to vindicate the revolution as a popular revolt. Some of its assumptions were naive, though understandable, as, for example, its perfect acceptance of the 'free' elections of January, 1849. Arguing philosophically from the principle of popular sovereignty, it concluded that "Pius never had any right, and on the contrary, Armellini, Mazzini, and Saffi had as good a right as, under the circumstances, any one could have, to rule in Rome and over the Roman States." The act of the Roman people, the writer said in summary, was

---

60 Punch, XVII (October 27, 1849), 163.
perfectly justified, and the intervention of the French was "not only a political error, but a political iniquity." With articles like this, the case for the Roman Republic was gaining not only sympathy, but logical justification.

As the new year 1850 came in and Blackwood's thanked God for having set things to rights in 1849, the Westminster Review was adopting Tait's earlier line, urging sympathy for the Italian insurgents on the grounds that they had simply been imitating British precedents. The rebels sought emancipation from tyranny and security against future misrule, the writer declared; they had merely made the mistake of attempting too much too soon.

Comparing the reactions of the press and the people to the Hungarian and Italian revolutions, the British Quarterly Review noted that somehow "the cause of Hungarian independence came home more powerfully than even the noble cause of Italian liberty." To account for this variance, the writer suggested four reasons. First, he said, Hungary championed constitutionalism instead of republicanism; second, the constitution of the Hungarians possessed a concrete and traditional character as opposed to the abstract and philosophic ideals emblazoned on the banners of the Italians; third, England felt more of a paternal interest in Hungary than it did in Italy, which traditionally looked to France; and fourth, (perhaps the simplest and most explanatory reason of all,) "Kossuth...seemed more of an Englishman
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than Mazzini."

This last point is of real importance, for it must be remembered that Punch and other segments of the press and public were drawn to support Pius IX in his early days largely because he seemed and acted so much like "a Briton." The mid-century Englishman was not so sophisticated and blase that he did not enjoy the flattery of imitation. The early Victorians were quite taken with their own merits and the merits of their country, though this manifest self-idolization generally assumed numerous disguises which kept it from being obnoxious. Englishmen were conscious of living in the freest, most civilized, wealthy and powerful nation in the world, and if they sometimes looked with disgust upon the antics of their American cousins, they always took kindly to reform movements on the Continent which appeared to take their inspiration from the British experience. The more these movements partook of the English ideals of order, liberty, and improvement, the more certain they were to receive English support. That in itself helps to explain in some part the pattern of responses evidenced in British public and press opinion throughout the years 1846-1850.

As early as September, 1849, reports were circulating that Pius IX was to return to Rome very soon, but the event did not materialize. From October to March, rumors of the return were frequent. The on-again-off-again character of the reports led the Times, the Guardian, and Punch to grow

66 Westminster Review, LII (January 1850), 490. This journal also struck out at the Times--"this tyrannic power...more hateful than the Inquisition"--for its course of opposition to revolutions. Ibid., pp. 488-489.

increasingly impatient, annoyed and cynical. They interpreted the Pope's hesitation as a sign of weakness and indecision, and they were agreed that the prolonged absence was a political mistake. "Of all the errors of his pontifical life," said the Guardian, this "has been the greatest."

When the official papers at Rome announced the Pope's return for the first Sunday after Easter, April 12, both the Times and the Guardian maintained a wary skepticism. "It is a rather ticklish matter," commented the Times, "to write anything respecting Papal affairs, deceived as we have so often been respecting them."

The Guardian was more sarcastic as it noted that the Pope's advisers "watch with such over-anxious timidity every variation of the political barometer, that a mere April shower, if it do but come from the north, may induce another change of plan." The Guardian never dropped its cynicism on this subject. A week later it wrote, almost in unbelief, "The Pope is actually en route!" and still it clung to its skepticism, observing that almost anything is yet likely to delay him. "In fact, to every thing like promptitude, decision, and vigour of purpose, Pius IX seems to have bid farewell for ever. He has ceased to be (if he ever was,) one of those persons who see but one straight line between the first step of a journey and the last."

Pius IX re-entered his capital April 12, 1850. The reception was warm.
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and sincere, though, as the Times correspondent pointed out to his English readers, it lacked the headiness of the demonstrations of February, 1849.\textsuperscript{72} The impressions received of this first reception varied. Correspondents of American newspapers described it as being wholly of official origin. They did not record any spontaneity about the crowds' reaction.\textsuperscript{73} The first report printed in the Times was somewhat along the same line. It expressed a doubt that the lack of vivas was due solely to the wishes of the Pope.\textsuperscript{74} Yet a few days later, the Times correspondent was interpreting the absence of boisterous demonstrations as a sign of a return to common sense and good order. The acts of the liberals, he reflected, had all been done to the cry of \textit{Viva Pio Nono}.\textsuperscript{75} The Guardian was singularly unimpressed with Pius' reception. The waving of ladies' handkerchiefs, it said, does not go for much in the Pope's circumstances and will not go far towards solving his problems. The apathy which prevailed in his absence, it went on, has proved that "all real attachment to the Papacy is completely dead in the States of the Church." "Can he revive it? Can he reign without it?"\textsuperscript{76} These were questions asked by a Guardian full of pessimism at a moment when the Italian refugees were the social lions in London, and journals like the Westminster Review were lauding Mazzini as "the Patriot, the Exile, and yet the

\textsuperscript{72} Times, April 24, 1850.
\textsuperscript{73} Marraro, Catholic Historical Review, XXIX, 504.
\textsuperscript{74} Times, April 18, 1850.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., April 27, 1850.
\textsuperscript{76} Guardian, April 24, 1850.
The *Times* appears to have been the only journal which seriously discussed the significance and implications of the papal return. Elsewhere, except as noted above, the event failed to receive any mention. The *Annual Register* for 1850 does not even note the fact in its summary of Italian events for that year. The lack of response in the British press tells significantly how little importance it attached to this event which marked, as it were, the end of the liberal experiment of the papacy. Seemingly, the press had already seen the Pope come full circle with the *motu proprio* and amnesty of September, 1849. The papacy was again what it had always been. The Pope in Rome or in Gaeta neither added nor detracted from the situation. Hence the press in general took as little notice of the return as it would of an ecclesiastical procession.

The reaction of the *Times* was one of pessimism. Its editorial was full of dark forebodings and dire predictions. The "wily and unbending priests" of Pius' cabinet, it said, achieved a victory over the French in successfully resisting any restrictions on the papal power. But, it went on, "although this shortsighted policy may pass for success in the Pontifical councils,...yet their triumph will probably be of short duration." The people are still dissatisfied, the writer continued, and "the spirit of the revolution, though suppressed, has not been quenched." The Roman States, he observed, are caught between the extremes of "a blasphemous democracy" and an inept, corrupt clerical government. The situation can result in

77 *Westminster Review*, LIII (April 1850), 82.
nothing but continued foreign domination, for neither extreme holds out any hope of tranquillity and good government. Either alternative, said the Times, "is fatal to the true interests of the nation." 78

Turning for a moment to the partisans of the Italian refugees, the Times remarked that there was in England "a class of persons who watch the course of events in Rome with more religious enthusiasm than political penetration, and who hailed the fall of the temporal power of the Papacy as the destruction of Antichrist." With a solemn voice of warning, the Times reminded these persons that the "mummery" and "arbitrary authority" of the Catholic Church "is certainly less fatal to truth and progress than the reign of anarchy which M. Mazzini calls the advent of 'God and the People!!' The editorial reprinted a passage from one of Mazzini's pamphlets in which he rejected original sin and the inequalities of nature, putting in their place a doctrine of communism and a hope of creating "the kingdom of God on earth as it is in Heaven." The Times urged the supporters of Mazzini to look well at what they were upholding. It is not the first time, it said, that religious principles have been used to assail society and delude mankind. 79

The weakness of the papacy, and the violence of Mazzini's party, concluded the Times editorial, consign Italy to foreign occupation and domination. Revolution or reaction are alike effected "at the cost of all that is worthy of the name of Italy." So long as the only alternatives are "the

78 Times, April 22, 1850.
79 Ibid.
uncontrolled bigotry of a timorous Government, or the lawless fanaticism of men leagued against all the institutions of society," the presence of foreign armies and the domination of foreign states are by far the lesser evils. Thus the Times showed itself to be far more afraid of radical liberalism than of all the despotism of Pius IX.

80 Ibid.
"Soyez tranquille!" Pius had said to the Duc d'Harcourt in 1849.

"Pie neuf restera Pie neuf." Fundamentally, Pius IX had undergone no great transformation at Gaeta. He returned to Rome in April, 1850, a wiser man, a more prudent and discreet ruler, but not a changed man. He still possessed and acted with the same gentleness, the same kindliness, and the same benevolence which had drawn so many followers to him at Spoleto, at Imola, and at Rome. He still pursued the same basic goals he had set for himself at the beginning of his reign. He was to go on ruling and reforming, seeking justice and a good administration for his people. In this respect there was no change whatsoever. Pius IX had been from first to last a sincere and zealous ecclesiastic, tending towards goals of right and justice.

What had changed was his confidence in his own judgment and in the power of charity and understanding as ruling instruments. After the restoration Pius IX was more inclined to act on the advice of political realists like Cardinal Antonelli, though he always reserved final judgments to himself. Changed, too, was his confidence in the men who had shouted for liberty and reform, for constitutions and armies. He had seen what enmity to himself and the Holy See lay behind the phrases of the liberals. Pius IX
was determined never to allow them a second chance to wrench the patrimony of Saint Peter from the papacy. The States of the Church were a sacred trust, and he would go on guarding it, aware of who its enemies were and what methods they used.

It was basically a change of means, then, and not of goals or personality, which marked Pius IX's return to Rome. To his contemporaries in Europe, however, this distinction was not at all clear. Faced with the problem of explaining the change between the Rome of March, 1848, and the Rome of April, 1850, the British press adopted the most obvious and, apparently, plausible explanation available. At bottom it was this, that the trauma induced by the November revolution of 1848, the flight, and the Roman Republic had caused Pius IX to turn his back on liberalism and human progress to seek the securing of his personal power in the absolutism fostered by his predecessors.

The development of this condemnatory judgment had been a gradual process. Before April, 1848, Pius IX had been temporarily deified as "the supposed incarnation for his time of a fancied promise of all good things that the heart can desire." After the allocation of April 29, 1848, the press more or less accepted the substance of Whiteside's interpretation that Pius had never been a liberal, but only an honest, well-intentioned reformer not wholly capable of handling the complexities and difficulties of his position. That attitude prevailed until the defeat of the Roman Republic in June, 1849, after which the British press grew increasingly annoyed with

---

1Edinburgh Review, XCIII (January 1851), 21.
Pius IX for refusing to accept any form of a conditional restoration. When it became clear that the re-institution of clerical government in the Papal States was due to Pius IX, and not to his cardinal advisers, the former respect which the British press had for the Papal personality changed to scorn and mistrust. By the time Pius IX returned to Rome in April, 1850, the press looked upon him as a petty tyrant and assumed that his regression from liberalism to absolutism was the effect of deep-seated defects in the papal character.

But if the press had settled to its own satisfaction the problem of accounting for the change in Pius IX after the fall of the Roman Republic, it had still to find an explanation of how, if Pius IX had never been a liberal, he had arrived at the tremendous popularity and following he achieved from June, 1846 to April, 1848. How had Europe, and England, been so deceived? The British press, in near unanimity, replied to that question by accepting the view that Pius IX was fundamentally a weak personality easily swayed by applause and flattery from pursuing the proper interests of the papacy. He loved the limelight more than duty and allowed himself to be pushed or dragged along the course of reform. Even when he seemed to be the great reformer and the savior of Italy, he was acting without apprehension, seeking only the approval of the crowds. Carried along by applause which fed his vanity, "without firmness of character, and perpetually irresolute; endowed with only mediocre talents, and slow in coming to a decision; timid and superstitious even when desirous to play the man, Pius IX permitted the agitation to increase until he was unable to control it, and appeared as the
head and patron of a movement which in his utmost heart he despised."^2 This quote from the North British Review sums up succinctly the judgment of the British press on the character of the Pope, which it believed to be the key to the course of events in the Papal States during the years 1846-1850.

The applause of the crowds, insisted the Edinburgh Review, carried Pius IX over and past obstacles he might otherwise have hesitated even to look upon. Driven by his "fatal love of popularity," (as the Quarterly Review had phrased it,) Pius IX was considered to have unwittingly stirred up expectations beyond what he was in truth willing to fulfill. He left hopes "encouraged but unsatisfied," said the Edinburgh Review. By his acts, he "found himself in the presence of passions and hopes which he had aided to raise, but was most unprepared to satisfy, and of which he had seen the growth without apprehending the force....He found the world more in earnest than he was or wished them to be."^3

Pius IX, in 1850, was believed to have acted against the advice of his reactionary advisers simply to hear the shouts and cheers of the crowds and to see them milling before his windows and begging his blessing. The Pope's counselors warned him, declared the Edinburgh Review, that he was recklessly opening doors he would not be able to close at his will, and all "his recent conduct indicates that he felt that his advisers were right, and condemned himself in his secret soul for not having given earlier weight to their representations."^4 By thus attributing the whole 'liberal' career of Pius

---

^2"Rome and the Italian Revolution," North British Review, XIV (February 1851), 334.

^3Edinburgh Review, XCIII, 22-23.
IX to a fault of a weak character, the British press was able to reduce the Pope's character to a level in keeping with its view of him as a weak-willed and small-minded despot.

History, concluded the writer in the Edinburgh Review, will pronounce Pius IX "to have been most of all wanting to a great opportunity; he will live in history as one more painful specimen of that commonest form of the irony of destiny—the common-place blown into factitious greatness, at length brought face to face with great events, and ignominiously collapsing." Abstracting from various degrees of bitterness, cynicism, and disappointment which marked the reaction of individual members, one can say that this final historical judgment made by the Edinburgh Review was the common opinion accepted throughout the British press.

That the final reaction of the press was due principally to Pius IX's rejection of liberalism and not to any prevailing sympathy for the Italian revolutionists or refugees was brought out clearly by some of the very journals which were the strongest supporters of the Italian cause. These complained bitterly because all the leading newspapers and periodicals

---

1 Ibid., p. 23.
2 Ibid., p. 21.
3 Hales states that the change in the attitude of the English toward Pius IX by the autumn of 1850 "was due to popular sympathy with Garibaldi's and Mazzini's stand at Rome, mightily fanned by the arrival of the many exiles following the French and Austrian occupation." Pio Nono, p. 142. The evidence given in this thesis seems to indicate that, in the press, at least, the change was due more to an indignation against the papacy rather than to any general enthusiasm for the resorgimento. The former was almost universal, while in the case of a number of the large-circulation journals and periodicals, the latter was definitely lacking.
maintained a steady antipathy to the Italian radicals and republicans. Sharpe's gave evidence, too, that the cause of Italian independence had not yet caught on with the general public. In July, 1850, it deplored the fact that compassion for the Italian refugees "has been withheld from them in a manner wholly at variance with our general character as a nation." "This general indifference to Italian sorrows, and Italian wrongs, on the part of the English public," it continued, "is mainly attributable to the false and malevolent light in which they have been placed before it, by some of our...most influential journals." How much those writers will have to answer for, Sharpe's declared, for having mislead nations and confused right and wrong. That the sympathizers of the Italian liberals made little headway during the rest of 1850 in altering the trend of the greater part of the press is apparent from another complaint, this time from Tait's, which, in December, 1850, violently charged the leading reviews and journals in England with consistently perverting the truth and distorting the facts in their treatment of the Italian liberals.

It is of significance, then, in the history of the British press vis-a-vis-Pius IX that a fundamentally unfavorable interpretation of that Pope had already been formulated shortly before the restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England in the autumn of 1850, that act of "papal aggression" which raised such a storm of protest among Englishmen. At the root of the British reaction was a deep sense of disappointment, and even

7"Reactionary Rome," Sharpe's, XII (July 1850), 112.
8Tait's, n.s. XVII (December 1850), 753.
betr. 

Hence, it was the rejection of liberalism, and not "papal aggression," which first caused the British press to adopt a posture of hostility toward Pius IX. The violent reaction to the re-establishment of the Catholic hierarchy created an abundance of sound and fury, but it changed almost nothing in the basic attitude of the British press. In fact, it may be suggested that the outrages of the press in November, 1850, and in the following year can be, and perhaps should be, looked upon as a continuance of the widespread and intense reaction to the papal rejection of liberalism rather than as a unique outbreak of No-Popery. The anti-papal feeling prevalent in England would certainly have been a factor figuring in any reaction, but one may wonder how different the press reaction to "papal aggression" might have been had the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy occurred in 1847. As it was, the action in 1850 could be interpreted as but an impudent challenge to the English government by a small-souled tyrant who, having failed to achieve the satisfaction of his vanity in the temporal sphere, was not intent on attaining it by extending his dominion over the consciences of men. Such a view is only an amplification of the reaction to the papal restoration.

9 The restoration of the hierarchy had been planned for 1848, but was delayed because of the Roman revolution. It was taken up immediately after the Pope's return to Rome in 1850. Hales, Pio Nono, pp. 139-140. For an account of the negotiations for the restoration by one of the principal participants, v. W. Bernard Ullathorne, History of the Restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England (London, 1871).
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