Midwestern Editorial Viewpoints on the Unification of Italy: 1846-1870

Alphons Francis Kuhn
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses

Part of the History Commons

Recommended Citation
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3465

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1938 Alphons Francis Kuhn
MIDWESTERN EDITORIAL VIEWPOINTS ON THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY, 1846-1870.

by

ALPHONS FRANCIS KUHN, S. J.

A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

JUNE, 1938.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ................................................. 1  
CHAPTER I. SOURCES OF EDITORIAL COMMENT ............... 6  
CHAPTER II. RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE ............................ 12  
CHAPTER III. ANTI-CLERICAL AND ANTI-PAPAL SENTIMENTS. 27  
CHAPTER IV. DEFENSE OF LIBERALISM ......................... 66  
CHAPTER V. PATRIOTISM AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS ... 85  
APPENDIX A ..................................................... 98  
APPENDIX B ..................................................... 99  
BIBLIOGRAPHY .................................................. 105
INTRODUCTION.

On reading the title it may be remarked that Marraro and Feiertag have treated the subject quite comprehensively. This paper is not an attempt either to question or contradict their findings, but rather to supplement the work already accomplished.

At least one feature of the previous studies seems to justify a further investigation. A glance at the bibliographies which they present, reveals the emphasis placed on eastern and southern sources of popular information and an almost total absence of any reference to midwestern newspapers. The extreme West is given slight attention, but Cincinnati, Ohio and Miami County, Indiana are the closest approach to representation of opinion from the Great Lakes Area. Granted that the population was not very dense in this region, yet in size Chicago at least, was a rival to Boston and Baltimore. Also, subscriptions to newspapers were quite representative, if measured by the standards of the time. This omission was, very probably, not due to any oversight on the part of the aforementioned authors,

3. Chicago Daily Tribune, Mar. 23, 1866 claimed the sale of 23,150 copies; cf. Appendix A #2.
but intentional, because the East was the traditional center of education and thought, and whatever news was forwarded inland passed through this channel.

On the other hand, together with the shift of the news center from Washington to New York, Horace Greeley, Henry Raymond and James Gordon Bennet established an innovation in the newspaper world at the opening of the second half of the nineteenth century. "Independent" and "Penny Papers," catering to the working classes and characterized by caustic editorials became the trend of the times. This movement made itself felt in the Midwest when Joseph Medill formed connection with the Chicago Daily Tribune. Moreover, the population of this region was alert, active and strongly opinionated. It was at Ripon, Wisconsin, and Jackson, Michigan, that the Republican party had its origin in the fifties. Though these newly created politicians may not have been the pacemakers, they nevertheless arose from obscurity and became a potent element in deciding the political destinies of the nation. Editors of the period were strongly partisan and in spite of the fact that the "official organ" gradually discarded its title, the cleavage was not immediately accomplished. Hence, it may not be amiss to pay some attention to the commentators writing for the constituents of Stephen A. Douglas and Abraham Lincoln.

4. In 1847 the Chicago Daily Tribune still under the editorship of Messrs. Wheeler and Forrest, carried as its masthead the slogan "Neutral in nothing—Independent in everything."
Neglect of these midwestern communities, which were then experiencing growing pains and shouting lustily, would be comparable to the consideration of burning questions of the present only from the viewpoint of urban dwellers with utter disregard of the rural antithesis. Nevertheless, a challenge to "eastern smugness" is neither intended nor implied. Briefly, the scope of this study is limited. It is regional and not national, and the present project is a digest of the editorial attitude without particular reference to its national or international bearing.

Furthermore, the approach is neither controversial or intended as an apologia, nor a vindication or indictment of the prevailing spirit of liberalism. Little attempt will be made to justify either the Catholic position or the temper of its assailants. Whether editors have been the directors of public opinion may be disputed, but even recent events such as the 1936 presidential campaign, will not present a contradiction to the statement that they feel the pulse of the populace and express the opinion of many.

It is also to be noted that the periods chosen in the previous studies emphasize the initial stages of the Risorgimento, whereas the present treatment will lay stress on the denouement. It was during this period that the Midwestern press abandoned the policy of acting solely as the vehicle of political propaganda and manifested its enterprising spirit by tapping a
source of information, rejected by eastern news agencies, but one which has now become the principal vehicle of transatlantic communication.

Finally, the advance of Italy in recent decades to the status of a nation, with a position of no small prominence in international affairs, makes it a timely subject. Historians, however, more concerned with the origins than with developments in modern states, will not find a further reference to ideas that prevailed among contemporaries of the creative period of United Italy superfluous, especially since critical students are tending to contradict previously accepted opinions on the Risorgimento.

Even within the limited scope of this survey as outlined above, an exhaustive treatment would be well nigh impossible, due to the number of possible sources no longer available or accessible. It will, therefore, be our purpose first to con-

5. According to the account in the Chicago Daily Tribune, Dec. 20, 1866, "Mr. Craig, the New York Agent of the Western Associated Press secured exclusive rights to Reuter telegrams by an agreement with the Reuter agent Mr. Mc Lane for a consideration of 3000 pounds per annum." The offer had been first made by Mr. Mc Lane to the New York Associated Press but rejected.


7. Probably the greatest collection of documentary and secondary materials on the Risorgimento is in the possession of Harvard University. The Chicago Daily Journal, May 14, 1847, mentions that in Wisconsin alone there were published 11 Whig; 10 Locofoco; 2 Neutral; 1 Abolitionist newspapers. In an account on Jan. 8, 1865 the same paper states that from 1822 to 1855, 41 Catholic periodicals were established in the United States of which 17 were then extant.
sider typical fonts of information which the editors of the Lake Area used to form the basis of their comments, and then we shall indicate the characteristics they manifested in presenting their views so that an opinion may be formulated as to the motives that animated their pens. These motives, which will form the succeeding chapters of this discussion may be reduced to the following:

1. Religious prejudice.
2. Anti-clerical and anti-papal sentiments.
4. Patriotism and political affiliations.
CHAPTER I. SOURCES OF EDITORIAL COMMENT.

Sorrentini, a Roman citizen, wrote in 1860:-

To those, who have hitherto formed their judgment from newspapers, filled only with extracts from the London Times, the Morning Post, the Siècle and Piedmontese papers, from lying and distorted telegrams, from correspondence, public and private, in which sectarian hatred contributes to blind the avowed partizan, something is due to enable them to know and judge men and events, as they are in fact. 8

An examination of articles appearing in mid-western newspapers indicates that "sectarian hatred" influenced writers but was not the sole motive. Political allegiance was generally the determinant which guided the editorial policy. It was the heyday of Know-nothingism, Radical or Black Republicanism, and the period when the Democratic party receded into the background. However, too often religious convictions entered the political sphere. These aspects account, in part for the selection of viewpoints upon which editors based their comments to present so-called independent or allegedly impartial opinions to their readers. Indeed one may say that the writers of these articles give concrete expression to the sympathies and disguised policies hidden beneath the platforms of various political camps, thus accounting for an impression that prevailed and still persists in some circles, namely, that the Democratic party has proven itself

favorable to and therefore worthy of support by Catholics.

Packet ships such as the Britannia and the Hibernia running in 1847, the Baltic in 1853, the Asia and the Persia in 1866, and the Nestorian in 1867 delivered European papers from which were gleaned the "extracts and advices" on foreign news. Prejudice is manifested in the decided preference shown in the selection of articles for comment. English papers, such as the London Times, London Economist, London Morning Chronicle, London Spectator, and the Pall Mall Gazette are the most frequently quoted. French and Italian mediums, e.g. Paris Constitutionnel, Galig- nani's Messenger of Paris, Opinione of Turin, Democratic Union of Ravenna also receive notice, but German opinion as it might appear in the Dresden Neue Freie Presse, or the Nord Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung is sought only relative to

12. Detroit Free Press, Apr. 13, 1866; Apr. 23, 1866; Nov. 19, 1854.
16. Ibid., Nov. 7, 1849; Aug. 14, 1851.
22. Detroit Free Press, May 1, 1867.
23. Ibid., Apr. 23, 1866; Nov. 23, 1870.
the Seven Weeks or the Franco-Prussian wars and very rarely in regard to the Italian situation. This selection may be partially accounted for by the fact that German editors following Bismarck's scepticism in regard to Piedmontese spirit of reciprocity were noncommittal or even hostile. Speaking of forming an opinion on the Crimean war, the Detroit Free Press acknowledges this dependence on British journals. It states:

"Viewing the question in either character, we are compelled to say that the position assumed under British influence by the greater portion of the American press, is a thoroughly false one. If we look at it from an American point of view, it is both false and pernicious. It is necessary for us to probe this matter to the quick, for it is our honest conviction that a more mischievous error was never propagated in this country than that now disseminated by our newspaper press."

Such censure seems like a forecast of Sorrentini's indictment. Although foreign journals that disparage or even ridicule the Papacy, its laws and enactments and articles as would induce false conclusions were quoted, this was not the invariable rule. The ultramontane party organ of Paris, the Monde, the Correspondance de Rome, a weekly issued "in

25. E.g., Koelnische Staats-Zeitung.
the interest of Popery" and the Civilta Cattolica are cited, but the reference is frequently such that it might be construed as a condemnation of the Papacy by Catholics or at least could be misinterpreted if read by one unfavorably disposed and unassisted by some explanation. On the other hand, some, especially the Democratic papers repudiate this method and quote entire texts to present the Catholic viewpoint. Yet Sorrentini was not exaggerating, for eastern republicanism has been charged with being infected by Puritanism, and some papers were not only radically republican but anti-Catholic in tone.

Champions of discredited minorities, be they Catholics or

31. Chicago Evening Journal, Jan. 12, 1870. A translation of an article appearing in the Civilta Cattolica on "Why the Ecumenical Council was called--The Probable Effect of the Council" which might be construed as a declaration of hostility by Rome.


34. Detroit Free Press, Mar. 12, 1868.


foreign elements from Germany or Ireland, were at hand, but there were none among the lay editors to oppose the Risorgimento explicitly. Reprints of articles from eastern papers as well as from Catholic journals occur, but in the main they are cited as presentations of particular viewpoints. Editorial comment, nevertheless, displays originality and independence of thought and not mere slavish adherence to standardized or syndicated propaganda.

Accounts of transpiring events are also contributed by special correspondents, whose letters are generally printed without editorial comment. If these be compared with the report of Count de Rayneval, the French envoy at Rome, sent to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, the letters of T. O'Dwyer addressed from Italy to the English press, and the judgment of Berkeley and others, the only conclusion possible is that they were vicious attacks that flagrantly misrepresented the case, and justify the censure of Sorren-

39. T. O'Dwyer, Pius IX and His Times, Burns, Oates, London, 1876, 90-93.
40. Berkeley, Italy in the Making, vol. ii.
42. E.g., Chicago Daily Tribune, Jan. 15, 1869,—special correspondence dated Florence, Dec. 14, 1868.
tini. Most correspondents, to say the least, were biased and whether stationed in London, Paris, Rome or northern Italy, made no attempt even to consider a view that might be unfavorable to the Risorgimento.

Finally, cable dispatches, although used in the later sixties to transmit information more rapidly, render primarily a mere statement of the event, and are admittedly unreliable because of their brevity and the immature consideration of the dispatcher who too often relies on mere rumor.

---


44. E.g., Detroit Free Press, Dec. 7, 1866.

CHAPTER II. RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE.

In a discussion of the various factors that enter into the formation and presentation of opinion to the public, it is necessary to consider the environment in which the protagonists were reared. Without this a true evaluation is unlikely. In stating that religious prejudice exerted a substantial influence on editorial policy relative to Italy's unification, it is not our intention to assert that it was a systematic or concerted action, but rather that there existed a conscious or unconscious frame of mind which inclined the writers to show a predilection toward any group that opposed their inveterate antagonist, the Church. No one will deny that the rationalism and materialism of the nineteenth century considered the Church its natural enemy because of its affirmation of an absolute, revealed and dogmatic truth. These philosophic systems implicitly, at least, denied all that the Church represented. Furthermore, the Papal State was a thoroughly Catholic institution, and hence, because of its intimate connection with a creed, any individual or group, especially one influenced by the philosophy of the age, would naturally be subject to religious antipathies in voicing its opinion on the Church's struggle to maintain her temporal sovereignty. Admittedly the United States was a Protestant country, and therefore those that expressed

themselves in the public press were by nature predisposed to attack the Papal government. Without doubt they would have vigorously resented any insinuation that they were prejudiced or swayed by any religious bias, but it would require almost superhuman traits to set aside the spirit of their times and their entire previous training and allegiance. Thus John F. Driggs, the representative for the sixth Congressional District, and one "of the lesser lights in the revolutionary party in Michigan," in a letter of Feb. 29, 1868, referred to the "life and death struggle" through which the republican party was then passing as a struggle "between the descendants of the 'Mayflower' and those of the pauper ships which landed their miserable cargoes in Virginia, between the Protestant elements of Florida, Louisiana and Maryland, and the more wild and anti-republican Irish Catholic, aided by a small unprincipled class of liberty-voting, office-loving and principle-deserting Americans." Again, the article, previously referred to, rejects the idea of a persecution of Catholics but admits a "crusade"... a "legitimate war of words, arguments, facts, fancies and rhetoric, which all parties are at liberty to wage." Furthermore, as Everett Dean Martin has said, "the Abolitionist movement found it necessary to carry a moral issue into the political arena ... and any difference of opinion may be transformed

47.Detroit Free Press, Mar. 12, 1868, "War on the Catholic Church"--editorial.
The era was one in which decided opinions were broadcast in emphatic and violent language, a period when opponents were mercilessly chastised without consideration of a possible refutation. Confiscation of Protestant editions of the Bible, and public burning of modern books, objectionable to Rome either because of their blasphemous representation of the founder of Christianity, such as Renan's *Life of Christ*, or because of their implied attack on constituted authority and faith could but appear as a bit of melodrama to practical minded politicians, and as an open attack on Protestantism and the advanced concepts of a materialistic and rationalistic age.

To non-Catholics the action of Roman authorities undoubtedly seemed to be discriminatory and not in accord with the essential and fundamental principle of our national existence. Catholics in this country during the colonial period, beginning with the Calverts and throughout the era following the Declaration of Independence, from Charles Carroll of Carrolton on, had demanded recognition of the principle of religious freedom. In externals at least, Rome acted in contradiction to this demand. Thus in 1867 it was reputed to have issued an

order closing "Weslyan chapels" in that city. Referring, in this connection, to Baron Ricasoli's advanced views the Daily Chicago Times points out that "it is not customary for the Pope to be advised by Italian ministers, that the true theory of church and state is to be found in allowing a mosque, or a pagoda, or a dissenting Weslyan chapel, to be erected by the side of St. Peter's."

Nevertheless, this order was interpreted as applying to the Protestant chapel at the American embassy and on this rumor alone without official notification a set of resolutions was passed by the House of Representatives which "virtually suspended our diplomatic relations with the pontifical government." Pius IX, it was admitted "could run his little territory after his own fashion" but the press took exception to Mr. King's hesitancy in vacating his post as our diplomatic representative. Although it is conceivable that the pope should object to the presence of Protestant institutions in the center of Catholicism, it certainly could not be expected to be interpreted as a friendly action by non-Catholics, and little cognizance would be taken of the fact that Protestant proselytizing had provoked the prohibition. It is rather sur-

51. Detroit Free Press, June 12, 1850, --reprint of a letter to the New York Herald, dated Rome, Mar. 2. Mr. Cass, our charge d'affaires, secured the permit to have divine worship conducted by the Rev. Mr. Hastings of Boston, the chaplain of the legation, according to the Protestant rite.


prising therefore to find a conciliatory editorial, maintaining
that one "English Chapel" was open and that the supposed threat
came in the form of an advice from the government of Rome to the
Presbyterian British Consul.

Furthermore Papal authority seemed unwilling to pro-
tect those not of the Faith. The slaying of Protestants by
fanatics, as happened at Barletta was adjudicated only as
murder and massacre, and there is little wonder that such vic-
tims were termed "martyrs." Second thought might prompt one
to suspect that since "King Bomba", a highwayman, was in control
of Barletta, Papal authority was flouted and would not approve
of such violent measures. However, because the riot was re-
ported to have been led by a monk, the most evident conclusion
of a hasty judgment would be that it was incited by religious
hatred, and little effort was made to sift the evidence and
arrive at a true presentation of the events. That requires time
and deliberation which is not at the disposal of journalists
whose guiding principle is to convey news immediately. Hence it
was unavoidable that many naturally felt themselves outraged and
if not inspired to retaliate, at least they might be relieved
when a change of government was in sight.

At times a more positive tone is assumed and aggres-

54. Detroit Free Press, Feb. 7, 1867, "Protestantism at Rome"--
editorial.
55. Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 15, 1866, "The Italian Parlia-
ment and Popery,"--editorial.
56. Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 27, 1866, "Decline of the Papacy"--
editorial.
sive Protestantism is aroused. Catholics in this country made efforts to establish parochial schools in order to prevent defection, and this question often served as a subject of controversy. The idea was expressed that the "whole masonry of the hierarchy would loosen" were the tradition of the Eternal City to be disturbed by the abolition of the Temporal Power, and thus Catholic activity would be retarded and the increase of Catholicism in this country checked. Contemporary Catholics were aware of this attitude and remarked that "sectarian partisans would regard the destruction of the temporal dynasty of the Pope as involving the destruction of his ecclesiastical power" and, therefore, the decline of the most formidable rival of Protestantism. It must be borne in mind that the defection of Newman and his imitators was still a thorn in the side of many.

Piedmont, on the contrary, supported by ideas of modern civilization and proclaiming the release from temporal and "spiritual oppression," was represented as arrayed against "ages of Pontifical and Imperial oppression." "Protestant

57. Detroit Advertiser and Tribune, Aug. 4, 1869, "The Roman Catholic Church and State Education"—editorial. Ibid., Sept. 22, 1869, "Roman Catholic Ultimatum"—editorial on Archbishop Purcell's demand for religious instruction in Public schools.

58. Chicago Evening Journal, Aug. 3, 1870, "The Holy Father and the War"—editorial, commenting on an article in the Western Catholic under the same title.


60. Chicago Evening Journal, Sept. 12, 1867, "The Pope and His Relations to Europe"—editorial.
Germany, regenerated Italy, and republican Magyar" were the protagonists of modern progress. French rejection of the Papal Encyclical in 1865 had been hailed as a repudiation of Papal authority, "a long stride towards Protestantism," and the new Kingdom of Italy was expected to follow the French example in abandoning the Pope's supremacy.

No doubt can be entertained of the Church's attitude toward the philosophies of the nineteenth century, but it was certainly doing violence to the Papal Bull of 1868 which summoned the Ecumenical Council, to claim that it "assumed the entirely worthless character of modern civilization." Yet "confessors and teachers of Evangelical belief" were expected "to accept the challenge of Catholicism and renew the efforts of Protestant controversy." Others, on the other hand, were willing "to accord that respect due to the Roman Catholic religion, that respect due to its many acts of benevolence, charity, and self sacrifice" and assured their readers that while "Protestantism has yet much of good to learn from Romanism" they need entertain no misgivings that the Pope could "usurp the province of civil law in this country." The Chicago Sunday Times goes even further when it gives the assurance that neither the

61. Chicago Daily Tribune, July 10, 1866, "Reconstruction in Europe"--editorial.
64. Daily Cleveland Herald, Jan. 16, 1865, "The Pope's Late Bull"--editorial.
Pope nor his agents have given evidence of a change of policy as regards this country and that all would do well to keep the even tenor of their way."

Such expressions can still be called conservative, but bolder spirits were not to be found wanting, and these stooped to open vilification, base libels and malicious blasphemy. In July 1868, the Reverend Doctor R. M. Hatfield delivered a sermon on the "Papal Allocution" in the Methodist "Centenary Church" of Chicago, which, though styled "sensational" was nevertheless considered worthy of a detailed report. When three columns are devoted to such an account, it cannot be said to be lightly passed over. Moreover, the Chicago Daily Tribune was not alone in devoting space to the incident, for other newspapers, inclusive of those in Detroit, considered it worthy of comment, either favorable or not. However, even some editors recognized the vicious absurdities that it emphasized. In brief it was a denunciation of Irish servant girls, branding them as "spies and assassins" and demanded a war of extermination against Catholics. Rome is painted as the persistent enemy of civil and religious freedom, then threatening to invade the United States. The mere fact that such sermons could be toler-

68. Daily Chicago Times, July 29, 1868, "The Jacobin War Against Roman Catholics"—editorial.
ated by supposedly educated and enlightened groups gives an indication of the tenor of the times.

It is quite evident, however, that the editors were wary and reasons drawn from the same sources can be brought forward to explain the situation. First of all, editors were obliged to respect the sentiments of subscribers who not only professed a militant creed, but practised it. Three years previously "advertisements" appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune which expressly requested "Protestants" for household duties. Such specifications, though not objectionable, would, at the present day, be interpreted as narrow-mindedness, especially if the situation were reversed and Catholics were demanded. One might expect to find such "want ads" in religious journals, but not in the public press. At least it is an indication that non-Catholics were not as indifferent to creed as they profess to be at present.

Secondly, party allegiance influenced editors sponsoring the election of Grant, either to approve of any methods that might gain support at the polls, or to refrain from open opposition lest they alienate an entire group. It was suggested by the Daily Chicago Times that the resolution proposed in the city council on July 27, 1868, did not act as a censure upon Doctor Hatfield, the "Methodist priest," but rather resulted in bringing him the indorsement of the radical party for whom he was

69. Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 12, 1865.
campaigning. On the other hand, because the same theme as that of Doctor Hatfield's sermon, served as the topic in "several" pulpits of the same city, it might be concluded that the Doctor's fulminations were not mere political ebullitions but the expression of studied convictions of a large group of citizens. In brief, the editorial policy during this episode was rather non-committal, if not directly opposed to the reverend doctor. Attention was drawn to the fact that at the close of the Revolutionary war, there were about half a million Catholics in a total population of three millions and in 1868 there were less than four million Catholics among the thirty-seven million Americans. Hence the "lives and liberties" of the nine-tenths were considered "tolerably secure" from attack by the remaining one tenth.

A similar attitude of restraint was exercised in regard to the mooted question of diplomatic representation at the Roman court which stirred the East. Scarcely any mention is made of this subject in the mid-west. One of the few to approve

70. Daily Chicago Times, July 29, 1868—"The Jacobin War Against Roman Catholics"—editorial.
72. Chicago Daily Tribune, Aug. 2, 1868, "Is Protestantism in Danger"—editorial. Detroit Free Press, Jan. 6, 1867, "Religion and Politics"—editorial:—"According to a recent article in the New York Tribune during our national existence the number of Catholic bishops have increased from 1 to 47; priests from 30 to 2,700 and communicants to 4,000,000 which with the exception of Methodists is the largest number."
the proposition of its abolition, is the **Daily Chicago Times**, but it does so only because, as has been previously indicated, Congress was aroused by the rumored closing of sectarian chapels. On the contrary, the **Detroit Free Press** relieves itself of a strict censure:-

... Thaddeus Stevens and his Puritanical crew see the necessity of a mission to Hayti, but think there is none whatever for one to the Holy City. They have long had a grudge against the Supreme Pontiff to gratify, and chose therefore a year marked by a ceremonial of unusual importance, and one which they knew would draw thousands of American Catholics to Rome, to make this insult more pointed. The pretext that the mission was useless—is the variest humbug, and will impose upon none, for all know that the United States embassy is to be closed because the Poor Pope addressed a letter of courtesy, with gentle prayer for peace and reconciliation to Jeff. Davis. 75

Suppressed hostility became clamorous when Catholic dogma was made the subject of editorials. Of course the bitter feeling aroused by the civil strife of the sixties did not subside immediately and may be a partial explanation as will be shown in a later chapter, but there is no doubt that sectarian hatred was not confined to the East. In an article entitled "Religious Intolerance" the **Detroit Free Press** scored this blind and irrational spirit, and the **Chicago Evening Journal** took the **Daily Chicago Times** to task for its lack of sympathy with the Methodists of the North, alleging that the latter were loyal

75. *Detroit Free Press*, June 1, 1867, "Saint Peter's Festival at Rome"—editorial.
whereas the former were encouraging the rebel armies. As the Detroit Free Press, the Daily Chicago Times and other democratic papers took up the cudgels in defense of Catholics, so their rivals wrote for the opposition. This is not, however, the equivalent of holding that the editors were members of either religious denomination. Nevertheless, the Chicago Evening Journal was certainly guilty of mischievous insinuation and misrepresentation when it printed in its columns:

Now that the Holy Father has been pronounced infallible, public interest in the Ecumenical Council has greatly subsided. The bottom seems to have fallen out of the concern. But the work has not been finished, the end is not yet. Among the questions still unsettled is the hagiological position of Joseph, the putative father of Jesus. Thus far he has been rather neglected, figuring only as an ordinary saint. It is said that Joseph stands a very fair prospect of being elevated to the rank among Papal demigods to which his marriage would seem to justly entitle him.

Ridicule of Catholic doctrines would have been sufficiently irritating, but only religious bigotry could have prompted such innuendo as appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 2, 1870:

78. Chicago Evening Journal, Aug. 9, 1870, "For Joseph"—editorial.
79. Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 15, 1870, "The Papal Incubus"—editorial. "... Now it was working through the College of the Propaganda to instruct the Buddhists in the mysteries of the Immaculate Conception; again it was attempting to persuade the Mexicans of the real presence of God in the Eucharist, or parrying the objection of the Aztec King, that, if Christians really ate and drank their God, he could see no reason why the Aztecs should not eat each other."
The Catholic Church having settled the point in its dogma of the immaculate conception (sic) of the Virgin Mother of God, that only a mother of immaculate conception can have a child of immaculate conception, it must logically assume that only an infallible mother can give birth to an infallible child. As Pio Nono has been declared infallible, then, upon every known principle of hereditary descent, his mother must also have been infallible. Now, as the faith of the Church is stationary, and, like the creed of the Democratic platform, "never changes in its enunciations when they pertain to the same subject matter," it must follow that, in order that the Church may be built up and edified by a truth so comforting as the infallibility of the Pope's mother, it must appear that it has always been comforted and edified by that doctrine. 80

In the sixties there were numerous Italian secret societies such as the Guelphs, Brother Companions, Republican Protectors that were attached to the Carbonari, while others formed more independent groups, as for example, the Libaria Tarba, Brother Artists, Defenders of the Country, Sons of Mars, Ermolaisti, Reformed Masons, American Bersaglieri, and Illuminati. Many of these, if not international in organization, as had been Mazzini's Giovine Italia, at least sent agents abroad. Some representatives, and we need mention only the most illustrious, Garibaldi, who became Grand Master of the Italian Masons, came to be esteemed as heroes by Americans. Significant of the vivid impression created by these personages is the fact that their memory lived on as is attested by statues erected in our public parks. Since the Christian Alliance of the United States had cooperated with Mazzini and had engaged

80. Chicago Daily Tribune, July 2, 1870.
81. Sorrentini, Revolution in Italy, 10.
82. Toledo Weekly Blade, June 15, 1865, "Garibaldi and General Grant"--editorial.
itself to use the press to spread his cause, it might be asked whether the agents for these brotherhoods, especially those which had branches in both countries, did not influence the editors in the sixties. Because of their importance and prominence we might single out the Masons. It is common knowledge that Masonic lodges were established in this country before the close of the eighteenth century and that they were widespread in both North and South America by the middle of the nineteenth. Even small communities, such as Elkhorn, Wisconsin, a village of fifteen hundred boasted its Masonic chapter. Newspapers took notice of their activities and expressed themselves in their favor. Furthermore, Gruber has cited numerous letters exchanged between Grand Masters of both countries, and other documents in proof of the common purpose of masonry as hostile to the Papacy. Hence the suspicion is not entirely fantastic. Yet whatever be the reason, there is no evidence that can be drawn from the newspapers themselves as proof of Masonic influence on the press. Even Sorrentini admits that "it is but fair

83. Berkeley, Italy in the Making, I, 245.
84. Elkhorn Conservator, Sept. 15, 1857.
to say, that those well informed in these matters, draw a great
distinction between Masonry in America and Masonry in Europe,
which is the director and supporter of Carbonarism and Illumin-
ism."
CHAPTER III. ANTI-CLERICAL AND ANTI-PAPAL SENTIMENTS.

The storm clouds of militant anticlericalism which broke during the last decades of the nineteenth century were gathering by 1860, and the rumbling of thunder could already be distinctly heard. Italy in particular served as the favorite topic of propaganda against ecclesiastics. Hope was expressed that the land, populated by a "thoroughly priest-ridden and abject people ... a people too ignorant to comprehend, too abject to resist ... might be liberated after fifteen centuries" from the domination of "priestcraft and superstition." Priests, it was said had wrung large tracts of land from the downtrodden, and ecclesiastical institutions, richly endowed, had maintained their inmates in comfort and pride." It was estimated that an annual income of almost two million dollars was consumed by twelve thousand, seven hundred and thirteen monks and nuns who "were non producers in the community" and "who gave only prayers and the counting of beads in return, with perhaps, on the part of the nuns, occasional nursing to (sic) the sick." Only the annihilation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction could rid the country of these "lazaroni, leeches upon national prosperity and public nuisances." Vast stores of wealth were reported to have been accumulated. The total annual revenue was estimated at thirteen million, two hundred thousand dollars which if capitalized at four per cent represented "an investment of over nine-
teen hundred million dollars owned and controlled by the Roman
Church in Italy." After "priests were stripped of their
wealth, their power would be impaired, while at the same time
they would be gradually ousted from all pernicious influence
upon the mind of the people." More sinister still was the
"discouraging feature of Italian society, the number rapacity
and immorality of its clergy." "No less than one hundred and
seventy thousand men in Italy lived by the altar. Some of these
priests," it was admitted, were useful in their profession, but
for the most part "they were a grievous nuisance." Certainly,
this was a sorry picture of conditions and one which could not
but elicit the sympathies of progressive and "righteous" Ameri-
cans. The appointment of Duncan, Sherman and Company of New
York as agents for Pius IX in negotiating a loan of four million
dollars, was classified as an attempt to "support a tottering
exchequer of a tottering priestcraft" and it was suggested
that "honest citizens would not support it."

But why was the Pope so powerful and why was he ex-
pected to retain his hold in spite of the prospects of the loss
of his temporal possessions? Again the Chicago Daily Republican
supplied the solution. "The 'Papacy,'" it said, "is more than
the Pope; it is a vast organization embracing a throng of men of

89. Chicago Daily Republican, Mar. 30, 1866, "Progress in Italy"--
editorial.
90. Chicago Daily Tribune, Mar. 30, 1866, "Italy in 1866"--edi-
torial.
91. Chicago Evening Journal, Nov. 7, 1866, "Italy"--editorial.
92. Chicago Daily Tribune, July 7, 1866, "Money for the Pope"--
editorial.
activity and mental superiority," which had, according to the Chicago Evening Journal, "covered the entire globe so that nowhere had its emissaries failed to penetrate and make their influence felt." "Obedience to priestly authority" had been inculcated as the primary tenet with such success that no one questioned the "right or wrong of the command but obeyed as a matter of course. To question a command would be to sin." Educated and enlightened members of the Church considered obedience a "pleasant, and Christian duty," but among the masses it was a "superstitious obligation." Meaner minds were "priest-ridden" and their natural superstitious were wrought upon and quickened into a firm belief "that to obey the church was the best way to serve God ... To the two classes—the intelligent and the ignorant—very different lessons were taught in the confessional or rather the same lessons were taught in widely different language. Both, however, tended to the same result." Both taught the sacred character of the hierarchy. Other writers insinuated, as an explanation of the situation, that the Jesuits "that Satanic Order, whose crimes are recorded in History" were active. "The spirit of Romanism has evidently not changed a tittle since the dark ages. The influence of the Jesuits is clearly as potent in the councils of the Church, as in the days

94. Chicago Evening Journal, Sept. 12, 1867, "The Pope and His Relations to Europe,"—editorial.
95. Detroit Free Press, Mar. 18, 1853, "Affairs in Europe"—Correspondence, dated Boston, Mar. 9, 1853.
Such statements clearly demonstrate, to be very conservative, that these authors were not favorably disposed towards ecclesiastics, and readers who accepted their editorials without protest would most likely neither have doubted the exactness of the picture nor checked on historical inaccuracies. Any statement, no matter how inaccurate or ridiculous, seems to have appeared legitimate, as long as it would leave the desired impression. Thus an editor of the Chicago Evening Journal wrote without wincing that "history shows that more than an hundred Popes (sic) were consecutively beheaded, as fast as they could be consecrated. ... The Church triumphed, and has ever since triumphantly pointed to their list of martyr Popes." Historical evidence would brand this either pure imagination or gross exaggeration. The Liber Pontificalis expressly mentions as martyrs only twenty out of the thirty two popes reigning in the first three centuries, the era of persecution, although it is generally accepted that of the thirty one pontiffs before the year 309 A.D. only Pope Dionysius did not lay down his life for the faith. After 309 A.D. there have been only two martyr popes, John I in the year 526 A. D. and Martin I in the


year 655 A.D. Reference also was made to historical incidents which had been exposed time and again and of which the refutation had been accepted by scholars, as, for instance the Galileo controversy and the mission of Tetzel to "sell indulgences" in Germany.

There was a certain crudity in these attacks which seems to hark back to the days of the Protestant Revolt. Apologists, could with very little effort give satisfactory explanations, such as would mark these statements as propaganda or pure twisting of facts for the sake of creating a spirit of hostility. Recognizing the danger of such subversive tendencies the Detroit Free Press severely censured the Washington Chronicle and the Boston Record as the "organs of first proof Puritan orthodoxy in Massachusetts," and charged that they were fomenting a war of religion "by their attack on the Pope and the spreading of ridiculous libels about priests and nuns." Similar expressions of indignation, though less forceful, could be adduced in answer to charges printed in the Mid-West. It is very marked that this sentiment of antipathy appears almost exclusively in the organs of the radical party. As a result one is inclined to suspect that the designation of blind, biased Puritanism levelled at that political party was not entirely unfounded. Had these editorials been printed in sectarian journals most men would classify them as examples of religious vilification and intolerance,

100. Detroit Free Press, Jan. 11, 1867, "Returning to their Vomit-Beautiful Subject"—editorial.
but as it stands they appear to be another instance of what has frequently been styled "the mud-slinging contest" so often attendant upon political campaigns.

Anticlericalism may have been vitriolic and confined to certain groups, but the anti-papal spirit was more deliberate, rational and widespread. I said, more deliberate and rational because, as is only too evident, the government of the Papal States had many deficiencies. Some of these defects were exposed by the Memorandum of the Five Great Powers of 1831, drawn up by the Prussian representative Baron Bunsen, by the Manifesto of Rimini, and by the works of Gioberti, Count Cesare Balbo and Massimo d'Azeglio. Although these were neither impartial witnesses nor motivated by strict justice, and although much can be said in defense of the Papacy, nevertheless it must be admitted that the government of that state was a bureaucracy, refusing representative institutions and controlled by ecclesiastics. Autonomy was not a prerogative exercised by the Roman populace. In consequence of the practice of evaluating Holy Orders as the initial step to preferment in government service, Roman youths without a vocation were not allured by ill-paid minor offices open to them, and hence were not politically interested. It is not our present purpose to review the Italian situation before 1870, but we must remark that the admissions of Papal sympathizers and the charges of the enemies of Papal sovereignty

render some justification for the criticisms of the American Press. However, in the Mid-West all the time-worn arguments, whether fair or prejudiced were resurrected. Marsiglio of Padua and others had centuries earlier issued their condemnation of Papal institutions, the Petrine supremacy doctrine, the executive authority of the Pope, the conflict of the temporalia and spiritualia and exemptions from civil authority, and they had lauded the advantages of popular sovereignty. All these arguments, with a dash of modern spice added were presented time and again without any reference to their hoary lineage. Modern versions, nevertheless, lacked the force of logic with which former antagonists wrote, and the case as constructed appears rather flimsy at times. One will seek in vain to find a complete and fearless presentation of both sides of the controversy. There is no examination of the defense; no pretense to consider why the Pope could not agree to the propositions made by his opponents; no attempt to explain why at least some demands were impossible. The die was cast and the verdict rendered beforehand. Italy must be united. The Papal States was the greatest obstacle, therefore it must go, whether justice was maintained or not. As the Chicago Daily Tribune confessed in 1870, "to make the Pope political sovereign of Italy is out of the question, and as his temporal rule in Rome was inconsistent with that of the union of all Italy, with Rome as its capital, the

Italian people have waited for this grand event—the bloodless removal of the capital to Rome."

Inefficiency was a primary argument against the Papal government. "The whole machine is run by a few Italian, Spanish and Austrian priests" but no reason was given why this should be essentially evil. Austrian influence is cited as a reason for the lack of productive industry, but no cognizance was taken of the fact that industry requires the outlay of capital, an element that did not abound in these regions. "Bad government, centuries of neglect and the resulting incapable and indolent population had desolated large regions, which were given over to wild beasts and malaria, but which might be redeemed for profitable cultivation." It may be admitted that the machine age with its development of modern conveniences had not penetrated, but "Life under the ancient regime had its bright side none the less. Poverty we have always with us, but poverty on a full stomach, under bright sunshine was a very different thing from the squalor and famine now so common in populous industrial centres ... Work was easy, wages low, living cheap; a succession of feast-days brought gaiety and colour into the lives of the poorest; the magnificent basilicas and churches were open from dawn till dusk, free to all. Poverty was not the barrier to the enjoyment of art, the splendour of poms and ceremonies." Added to this, it must not be forgotten that

103. Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 29, 1870, "Italy and Rome"—editorial.
the last half of the eighteenth century saw in the United States the struggle for the "full dinner pail," that even before the civil war many propagandists had decried the evil influence of slavery as a form of "cheap labor." Hence the masses in the United States, themselves struggling for a higher standard of living would find an appeal in editorials that displayed the social evils resulting from governmental indifference. More conservative was the judgment of the Detroit Free Press, when it stated that "Catholicism is not necessarily the enemy of all material progress, individual liberty and science. There have been periods when these interests were carefully fostered by it, and it is only the unskilled defensive which as a natural sequence of retrogression has driven Catholicism in opposition to them."

Not only the lack of material progress and increased prosperity caused indignation, but also the fact that the few possessions of the population were threatened. Spero, the correspondent of the Chicago Daily Tribune reported from Turin August 22, 1866 that brigandage was prevalent near Palermo, Florence, Naples, and in the Papal States especially in the Department of Frosinone, "where life and property had become entirely unsafe. ... Bourbonism and Reaction," he asserted, "not liberty and the constitution have fathered these pestilent disorders." Next year the conditions were reported as still

106. Detroit Free Press, Jan. 6, 1867, "Religion and Politics"--editorial.
more alarming in the Papal States, especially in the province of Civita Vecchia where "inhabitants daily received threatening letters demanding large amounts of money" and if the request was refused "the property of the parties was invariably destroyed with great recklessness." Papal troops were given credit for making "the most extraordinary exertions to put down the banditti." Even we modern gangster-ridden Americans would question the effectiveness of the police force. That the evil existed, of that there can be no doubt. Cardinal Wiseman devotes an entire chapter of his book, Recollections of the Last Four Popes, to brigandage. Berkeley, however, gives an explanation of the organization of the Centurioni and how they, instead of serving as a police force, became in reality a body of party assassins. Little else could be expected when we consider the disturbed conditions then existing, the frequent uprisings, the disorderly and violent conduct of revolutionaries in the name of liberty, and many other similar factors.

Added to this, the Church employed mediaeval practices in conducting the government. Heavy burdens of taxation were said to have rested upon the populace, although in reality they would appear ludicrous to the modern taxpayers in this country. Emile Carrey, the Paris correspondent of the Chicago Daily Tribune, transmitted a list of the requisition of the Apostolic Prothonotary: "Nine thousand gold crowns for Parma, which have

108. Cardinal Wiseman, Recollections of the Last Four Popes, Donahoe, Boston, 1858.
been owing since 1515; a hackney for Naples; and twenty five
dishes, nine gold salvers and four hundred and fifty pounds each
of wax, sugar and pepper." Compared with the cry of enormous
taxes, "squandered upon a lazy, idle set of princely beggars,"
this continuous "owing of taxes" appears somewhat ridiculous.
"Prelatic despotism" was pronounced "the curse of the dirty,
vicious, squalid city" of Rome.

Political machinations and tyranny were enumerated
as characteristics of the Pontifical State. Practices of the
dark ages were reported to have been reenacted at the Vatican
Council. Two Armenian prelates, for instance, dissatisfied with
the proceedings of the Council desired to leave and take part in
the new Armenian schism. They were closely watched in a monas-
tery and escaped only by employing wily stratagem. Thus was
defection prevented. When Cairoti and a band of seventy in ac-
cord with Garibaldi's plan of deliverance of Rome, partially
blew up the Roman barracks of the Zouaves and set fire to the

110. Chicago Daily Tribune, August 5, 1868--Correspondence.
111. Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 29, 1870, "Italy and Rome"--
editorial.
112. Chicago Evening Journal, July 29, 1870, "Napoleon and Pius
IX"--editorial. Illinois Staats Zeitung, Jan. 9, 1861, "Die
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114. Chicago Evening Journal, June 4, 1870, "The Vatican Council"--
editorial.
ruins, they were executed. In this manner revolutions were suppressed but its victims were proclaimed as martyrs of Italian liberty.

With the popularization of the idea of universal education as a background and the contemporaneous Catholic attack on state conducted schools, it is little wonder that the editors emphasized illiteracy as another factor in the delayed material progress of the Papal States. Massachusetts had passed the first law for compulsory school attendance in 1854, and by 1860 the principle of a free, tax-supported public-school system covering all stages of education had been generally accepted. It was held that education would prevent the increase of crime and pauperism in our growing cities and that democracy could survive only if the masses were educated and could thus exercise their right of suffrage intelligently. The Federal Government had given impetus to the proposition by land grant endowments as the states had entered the union, but the climax was reached by the Morrill Act of 1862 which provided that for each representative and senator thirty thousand acres be given to found mechanical and agricultural schools. In other words Americans were paying a great deal of attention to the development of natural resources, expecting prosperity to result from the dissemination of the results of study and research. The Papal States were behind "all others in Italy in industrial pursuits," as the result of ecclesiastical control of education. Only one fifth of the common people, it was stated, were provided with the means of
instruction. Cardinals and Pontiff were held responsible for the "sluggish do-nothing policy which has marked the Papal State in all those departments of progress which are the life and soul of Protestant nations." Ascribing the advance of Protestant countries as compared with the delayed material progress in Catholic states, to the "stultifying" nature of Catholicism was not a new line of thought. It was held in centuries past and was now asserted anew that the power of the Church rested on pious frauds, the operations of wily priests, and on the superstitions of the masses. Free schools, particularly those of Prussia, were accredited for undermining the temporal sovereignty of the Pope because they were the leaders of the movement against the "Reaction" which then dominated Italy. Pius IX, according to these editors, had recognized the threat and had exerted every effort to abolish these same schools. Moreover he had protested the "advanced laws on education passed in Austria in 1868," laws which placed the supervision of education, literature and science, and the inspection of schools in the hands of civil authorities. But all protests were futile, the Pope had merely vented his "impotent spleen." Compared with papal opposition was the state control and protection of educa-

118. Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 8, 1870--editorial.
tion as promoted by Piedmont. In view of the agitation concerning education then stirring the United States could there be any doubt which of the alternatives was adopted by editors in this country? "Under the old regime instruction in Italy was only the candles of devotion, kindled by the priests alone, and that too for the service of the altar; now it is the sun at noon tide, shining for all."

"Papal absolutism" was a special point of grievance and called forth bitter invective in the attack. When in December of 1864, the Sovereign Pontiff issued his encyclical, some rejoiced that Pius had "so clearly drawn the lines," and interpreted his words as a "blunt statement that the Roman Catholic Church was founded upon the principle of absolute spiritual and temporal despotism." Furthermore, because of the Church's continuous affiliation with the monarchs of Europe and especially her more recent dependence of France and Austria in temporal matters, the Papacy was regarded as the "mainstay of prerogative." In practice the Papacy, it was remarked, was autocratic although it had attained its preeminent position by principles that were democratic; namely equality of men in the sight of God and the Church; the possibility of peasants rising in rank above a prince in the ecclesiastical state and that, "not royal blood, but intellectual and religious merit" deserved to rule both in

120. Chicago Evening Journal, Nov. 7, 1868, "Italy"—editorial.
the Church and State. Moreover, claims of universal spiritual sovereignty, made by the Pope were especially odious to editors. Many thought it merely another instance of unmitigated audacity and arrogance.

To climax this presumption of absolutism and secure its centralization and perpetuation Pius IX, editors thought, deliberately proposed the doctrine of infallibility as part of the schema of the Vatican Council. As proof many cited the action of the Fathers of the Council, who, expecting opposition in all countries due to the struggles of Liberalism, were opposed to the promulgation of this dogma as inopportune. This dogma had been held throughout the ages; it was not a new doctrine; but its solemn definition stirred up an unusual amount of hostility. Throughout the centuries the Church was democratic in some respects. She had been the ally of the people against the usurpation of power, and after the Reformation by opposing the foundation of national churches she had been the chief obstacle to the concentration of authority, religious and temporal, in the hands of the regents. Infallibility was interpreted as a coup d' état by which it was proposed to transform the "Universal Christian Republic" into an autocracy. Councils, which editors compared to general assemblies representing the masses, were "no

longer to decide what the faith and polity of the church shall be." Unlike the Protestant Churches who look to the future, who give up "one error after another" and accept "the truths of science and reason," who are "ready to go to any length rather than let the old ship go down beneath the waves of progress" the Roman Church refused to yield one iota, and "looked to the rear for light and examples." Infallibility, in brief, was styled "humbug." It was an "impediment to progress" and "a dogma from the dark ages," resulting only in sharpening the "antagonism between Roman Catholics and the outside world, ... dwarfing the powers and influence of the hierarchy outside of Rome." It was a "movement of separation and of centralization." Thus, editors thought, they had penetrated the smoke screen and indicated the real reason for the delay in approving the dogma by "the outside hierarchy."

Promulgation of this dogma could, it was estimated, have two effects. It might lead to a schism under the leadership of Doctor Dollinger, or it would at least antagonize non-Catholics and prevent the spread of Catholicism. It would, it was declared, affect the whole foundation of the Church.

Instead of, as has hitherto been the case, a Catholic being able to say, I believe a certain thing because the Church of all times bears witness to it—that Church, unto which belongs the promise that it shall ever remain in possession of truth—he will henceforth have to put, instead of that Church which compasses all time and all space, a single individual: the Pope. He will have to say this or that, because the infallible Pope teaches it. And why is he infallible? Because he says so himself. 129

Likewise the spirit of the dogma was considered abhorrent to Protestant countries, especially the United States and Great Britain where the Church had shown marvelous increase during the past decades. Any "one man policy" was regarded as "repellent to all liberal minds and disintegrating to the Church." It was spoken of as a "suicidal demand," a "reactionary step toward despotism that would only check the progress of Catholicism."

One of the main arguments of Protestantism against Catholicism is this dogma of papal infallibility. After having spent some centuries in denouncing it, Protestant clergymen can scarcely be expected to yield up their own faith, and assist in establishing it. To do so would be to stultify and contradict their own record. 132

Another article emphasizes what the author considered an open historical contradiction contained in the dogma and points out the consequences:

The enunciation of the dogma of infallibility cannot but have a disastrous effect upon Catholicism. The opponents of that faith cannot wish Catholicism any more injury than it will inflict on itself when it asserts to be a truth what

129. Detroit Advertiser and Tribune, June 4, 1870, "Papal Infallibility"--editorial.
130. Chicago Evening Journal, Apr. 16, 1870, "Infallibility"--editorial.
all history shows to be something quite the reverse. With
all deference to the occupants of the pontifical throne, it
cannot be denied that some of them have been very bad men.
Some popes have excommunicated other popes; and Catholic
writers may be freely quoted as evidence that corruption
and rascality have, on several occasions made their home in
the Vatican. To assert infallibility of these men will be
to assert what no sensible man of any faith can believe for
a moment. Hence, the requiring of thinking men to accept
as a truth what they know to be an untruth, will weaken the
influence of the church. 133

Editors not only predicted disastrous results to the
Church itself but likewise the disruption of peace throughout
Europe. Quoting the Paris Constitutionnel, the Chicago Evening
Journal states:-

It attacks the concordats in their essential basis as being
arrangements between the spiritual and temporal power, and
constituting treaties between the Pope and different Govern-
ments. On the day when His Holiness shall have the right to
speak in the name of his infallibility, where will be the
sanction of these conventions? They will no longer possess
even the guarantee of a plighted word; for a sudden revela-
tion from the Holy Spirit may cause the annihilation to-day
of what was agreed on yesterday, and Pius IX will dispense,
if he pleases, with executing the engagements of Pius VII.
134

Although the declaration of infallibility as limited to the re-
ligious sphere was recognized, nevertheless Rome was considered
adroit in mixing spiritualities and temporalities, and it was
feared that before long the Pontiff would extend the claims of
his power and thus he would become a real threat in practice if
not in theory. A circumstance could arise in which the task
of drawing the line which separates these two spheres would be

133. Daily Chicago Times, July 12, 1869, "The Proposed Dogma of
Papal Infallibility" -- editorial.
134. Chicago Evening Journal, Mar. 30, 1870 -- extract from the
Paris Constitutionnel.
very difficult and hence, some thought that if the Holy Father believed himself "infallible in one category of facts" he would naturally hesitate to think that he was not so in others which joined them. In reality this presentiment was not entirely unfounded and partially explains the attitude of so many. We must bear in mind the philosophic thesis of the existence of two perfect societies, namely the natural society which is the State or civil society and the supernatural which is the Church. Each is perfect because each is absolutely independent of any other society in its existence, objectives and means of attaining those objectives. However, since the same individuals are subjects of both societies, it is only to be expected that there will arise many borderline propositions. Thus, for instance, matrimony, in its aspect of a sacrament, falls under the jurisdiction of the Church, whereas it is subject to the state in its civil consequences. No sooner was Piedmont in control than it issued a provisory code constituting "the State a law unto itself." Previous to 1865 the law "made the precedent blessing of the church necessary; the want of it vitiated the most solemn acts of civil life." Hence the Church, as custodian of the sacraments had claimed the right to determine who could receive the sacrament and thereby excluded many from entering matrimony. The Church, basing its decisions on the Divine as well as the natural law.

137. Chicago Daily Tribune, Feb. 2, 1866—Special Correspondence, dated Florence, Jan. 4, 1866.
maintained its jurisdiction despite the purely civil consequences.

To others infallibility appeared as deification. "The same attributes of character which caused Tiberias Caesar to proclaim himself god, caused Pio Nono to proclaim himself infallible."

On the other hand some editors considered the papal pronouncement of infallibility as futile and prognosticated that it would receive little attention except in "ignorant and benighted Catholic countries." Therefore, instead of a spirit of alarm we find that of ridicule. In this vein an editor of the Chicago Daily Republican wrote:

If the Pope be infallible, as he is declared to be, one would suppose he had only to exercise that infallibility to solve his doubts—that a council however 'Oecumenical,' could not add to the wisdom which is already absolute; but for some reason his Holiness prefers to seek the advice of those who are not so infallible as himself. 140

And the Chicago Daily Tribune continued,

His Holiness' infallibility in the decision of moral and religious questions must enable him to perceive that all questions are moral or religious which pertain, in any manner, to the defence of the Church. He will therefore, be infallible in guessing at the nature and strength of the conspiracies forming for his overthrow; infallible in contriving plans for circumventing and cheating his enemies, and, if not omnipotent in resisting them, then his infallibility will, at least, inspire him with the knowledge when,

139. Chicago Daily Republican, July 16, 1870, "Papal Infallibility"—editorial.
how fast, and in what direction, to run to save his infallible neck from his fallible enemies. 141

Of course anyone acquainted with Catholic doctrine would immediately deny the premises of the above statement, but as we have already pointed out, it is not our present purpose to reply to editorial comment, but only to present these opinions.

Finally, some editors made an attempt to be impartial. On August 31, 1870, the Daily Chicago Times published a lengthy reprint of the pastoral letter of Archbishop Spalding representing the Catholic views. Nevertheless it is noticeable that this was an exceptional case.

Increased distaste for the Papacy was created through the continued support and maintenance of the temporal sovereignty by foreign powers. Foreign bayonets employed against Italian subjects became the theme. Reviewing the events which led to the French invasion the Detroit Advertiser and Tribune represented Pius IX as having "obstinately resisted" popular movements for reform, and of "opposing the projects for Italian independence in which his subjects eagerly desired to participate." When the people had taken matters in their own hands and revolted, the Pope had fled. Instead of acceding to their demand and returning he had preferred to accept the aid of Napoleon who sought to capitalize on the event. Craftily proceeding, Napoleon induced Piedmont to take aggressive measures against cler-

143. Detroit Advertiser and Tribune, Nov. 13, 1865, "Evacuation of Rome"--editorial.
ics whilst he remained inactive so that he might force the Pope to compromise and allow him a free hand in France. At the same time Father Beckx, the general of the Jesuits issued a proscription of Victor Emanuel. With similar misrepresentations another editor wrote that the "Pope's temporal government is by no means popular, either in or out of Rome, and the government and the people of the Kingdom of Italy are scarcely more anxious to take and occupy the city and Papal States than the majority of the inhabitants are to have them do so."

Common experience teaches us that when agitators are at work, the mobs shout lustily. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the lack of sympathy with the Roman sovereign displayed in other articles was not entirely without reason. It was true that "the conflict between the Pope and the people of Italy was radical and fundamental" because if he were to remain independent of any state as his religious office required he could not be dominated by the ultimate veto of representatives of the people. He was maintained "by foreign bayonets for political reasons to please the Romanists in other countries."

Whatever reasons partisans of either cause may assign as an explanation of these circumstances, it must be conceded that

146. *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 9, 1865, "The Papal Question"—editorial.
French occupation had an evil effect on Papal prestige. Pius IX was considered as a protégé of the Emperor, and his appeal to France could be interpreted as a "proclamation of weakness, ... and a sign of the rapid decline of Papal power." No doubt he "drew upon himself and the Church, the criticism of all Protestant nations." Then later when cable dispatches reported that the Pope sent agents to the United States to enlist men for his army, editors were easily deceived. One asked: - "what is the matter? Can he (Pius) not trust the Italians? Don't they love the good old Head of the Church? Or is the name of Garibaldi too much endeared to them, and their love of freedom too strong?" Whether we accept this dispatch or question its reliability the fact remains that the strength of the Papal army lay in its mercenaries. Cardinal Bernetti's chief aim during the Pontificate of Gregory XVI had been to establish an army that would make the government independent of the support of Austria or France. However, in order to maintain the peace during the troublous times of the nineteenth century, he would have been obliged to establish a contingent of at least one hundred thousand who were absolutely loyal and unaffected by the spirit of the times; for the papal troops would have been obliged to cope with foreign armies and at the same time with domestic mal-

147. Chicago Daily Republican, Nov. 24, 1866, "The Pope"--editorial.
149. Chicago Daily Republican, June 10, 1868, "The Army of the Pope"--editorial.
contents. An almost impossible requirement. Volunteer forces which were enlisted, called centurioni, proved to be unreliable, and it is hard to say whether they were any better than the revolutionists and ruffians they were pledged to hold in check. Reliance on foreign arms, although it was necessitated by force of circumstances, did without question place the Pope in the false position of a sovereign who manifestly was unpopular and in fact opposed to his own people. Hence editors cannot be entirely blamed for questioning the advisability of such procedure. Their fault lay rather in a lack of mature, unbiased research and evaluation, qualities that characterize not the journalist but rather the historian. Journalists would judge only by externals and the evident, and could not be expected immediately to arrive at the conclusion that the Risorgimento was the work of a few and not the result of a mass movement.

From the premises that the Papal Government was inefficient, assumed despotic objectives and used tyrannical means as a result of temporal power, editors of the Lake Area in accord with the common position, concluded that it would be beneficial both to the Church itself and to the State if the two spheres of action were separated. Moreover they had the example of the United States, where this theory had been applied.

Among Catholics themselves two groups lent plausibility to such a conclusion; these extremists might for lack of a better name be called progressives and moderates. Progressives

were enthusiasts who, elated by the Oxford movement hoped to bring back, into the fold many sectarians by inducing the Church to compromise on some doctrines that proved a stumbling block to possible neophytes. They also saw the progress of democracy in Europe and were ready to overlook essential differences between the basic principles of ecclesiastical government and the objectives of liberalism. The Papal States presented a serious obstacle to votaries of democracy and hence the progressives "rejoiced in the overthrow of temporal power and the reduction of the Pope to the position of a mere spiritual ruler." They sought "further modifications in the Church which they loved so well, as would make it better accord with the age in which they lived." Such Catholics gave substance to the editorial opinion that predicted roseate prospects for the Church in the future if she "abandons the worn out, effete dogmas that were suited only to the dark ages," a Church which "with its influence, its organized machinery, its zealous workers may do more than it has ever yet done toward the improvement of the world."

Moderates, on the other hand, were not quite so "advanced" in their views. They read the handwriting on the wall, and were fully aware of Piedmontese intrigues. Loss of the Papal States they considered a calamity, though "not fatal to

the perpetuity of the Papacy or unity of the Church." States officially Catholic had embarrassed rather than served the Church in the past. Possession of sovereignty and independence was necessary to the Pontiff lest he become a minion of a civil sovereign, but the retention of the Papal States or Rome itself was not an essential. Fears of the consequences of a seizure could be allayed. Theories of separation of Church and State would not spread to the greater Catholic nations because that separation had already been accomplished. France, though the population was Catholic, supported the clergy not as ministers of religion but only as functionaries of the state. Italy and Austria were following the example of France. Spain and Portugal could not be rated as great powers. Such theories might spread and become a source of danger, but only in Protestant countries where national churches flourished which were in reality State established. Nor did they envision a "war on Church property" in other countries, for in each there were millions of Catholics who could unite to maintain the verdicts rendered on disputes previously settled by law. This group was responsible for the "large sentiment existing even among Catholics, to the effect that the cause of the Church will receive no detriment from the absorption of Rome by Italy." They "avowed the opinion that the less the head of the Church has to be bothered with temporal cares, the more time will he have to devote himself to ecclesi-
astical duties and the welfare of his flock." This faction, editors maintained, "believed that were the Pope's sphere thus limited, the Church would be rid forever of the harassing complications which of late years have surrounded the question of temporal sovereignty; and that, acting simply as the spiritual head of the Church, he could devote himself undisturbedly to the advancement of its interests."

To summarize the reasons the press advanced in advocating the separation:-

First:— Temporal power in inconsistent with religious spirit. In their opinion, government was the "last function for which a priesthood was adapted," and the dissemination of a religious faith of any kind was wholly foreign to the province of any government. Government rests on force and coercion, religion on persuasion and love. If resisted, it was the duty of the government, they explained, to punish, whereas in the same circumstances it was the duty of religious to pray. In short, "the means used, and ends pursued by the two are eternally so unlike as to render it impossible that the two functions can be united in the same class of men."

Second: Loss of the Papal States need work no real injury to the Catholic Church. As spiritual head of the Church the Pope's authority would remain supreme and "no political

changes could in the least affect her power in this direction, providing she keeps pace with the advancing progress of civilization." Moreover the Catholic Church possessed elements not found in Protestant Churches. Her ceremonies, though contemned by enlightened Christians, were a powerful instrument in the conversion of unbelievers. She was the most perfectly organized religious body in existence and her members were heart and soul in the work. Furthermore, Ultramontane Catholics were expected to use the distinction that de jure the Pope remained master of the States of the Church, whereas de facto he was dethroned as a temporal sovereign.

Third: A decayed nobility, once the champions of the Church but for several generations back pensioners of the Church would be the only ones to suffer. In order to support these the Church had been obliged to "depend upon foreign contributions" besides exacting exorbitant taxes. This money could now be applied to a more worthy cause, the dissemination of the faith.

Fourth: Since the seizure was "made by a Catholic king, who led an army of Catholics" ... "sectarian hostility and religious scandal would be avoided." It was a "Catholic power that was bestowing the cup de grâce to the dogma of temporal sovereignty" and Catholic historians would not be tempted at a later date to ascribe it to the work of an heretical power.
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They forgot however that the spirit of Liberalism was the root of the evil, and Piedmont was not alone responsible for its influence in Italy.

When the press discussed the real reasons why Catholics tenaciously maintained the necessity of the Papal States, it missed the issue entirely. Some said that it was a "mediaeval concept." Like Judaism the Church was a theocracy, a "veritable government of God on earth." "But for the visible head of a theocratic government to be subject to any earthly power seemed a contradiction in terms." Archbishop Hughes was quoted to corroborate this statement. He had said:— "There are but two civil states possible—that of ruler and that of subject. The head of the Church, Christ's vicar on earth, cannot be a subject; therefore he must be a ruler." Taken in itself this quotation could thus be interpreted. However, the article in the Chicago Daily Tribune already referred to, and quoting the Catholic World presented the true case. It reads:

Temporal sovereignty of the Pope is adhered to in order to leave the ecclesiastical officer independent of any political domination. To make him the subject of a political prince, is to place him politically under the dominion, and to that extent under the civil control of that prince. It is to expose him to the trials which Pius VII. endured when a captive in the train of the first Napoleon. 163

In other words, the Pope was head of a Church that claimed universal jurisdiction, that is, she included as members men of all nations and her mission was to all mankind. Hence he must be

163. Ibid.
above all national allegiance, and not be influenced by mere national considerations. If he were, he could not be impartial. One editorial is so outstanding in its clarity and sureness of vision that an extract from this exceptional discussion of the Papal question is almost inevitable.

The unity of Italy, or at least of Piedmont requires the sacrifice of the Church States, that is the mediatisation of the Pope. But as the worldly ruler of estates happens also to be the spiritual head of the Catholic Church, we have here not only an Italian question, but one whose bearing extends much further. The Pope, as the head of a religious government embracing so many nations within its jurisdiction, can hardly be expected to become the subject of any other sovereign, without fatally compromising the dignity and independence of the Catholic Church. If the new Italian Kingdom therefore, thinks that it cannot exist without Rome, the Pope may well say that he cannot exist without Italy. The question of Italian unity is a local question, for the Italians to decide, but that of the unity of the Catholic Church is one which interests the people in all parts of the world. 164

Stranger still, one editor conceded that the Italian Revolution was in reality a religious one. It had as its objective the reform of the Church.

As might be conjectured from the general attitude toward the Papal States, satisfaction was expressed when the unification of the Italian peninsula was finally a fait accompli. When France had withdrawn her troops from Papal soil, it had been deemed the "heaping of the earth upon the coffin of Papal power." All that had remained to be done was "to recount the
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history and write the epitaph of the great entombed." The retirement of Cardinal Antonelli from the position of Secretary of State to Pius IX was this engraving of the epitaph, "the public official recognition of the dissolution of the Papal States and the end of the Pope's temporal power." Pius IX then, was expected to become a subject of the king and parliament of Italy, "in a civil sense an adjunct of the Italian secular government." He, however chose to accomplish the design of the revolutionists by becoming "the prisoner of the Vatican." While he remained the "accredited honored head of a great spiritual government," but in the altered position of "chief bishop and no more." Mazzini had begun the revolution, and with the aid of Garibaldi laid Rome in ruins during the insurrection of 1849. Garibaldi supported by English dissenters and Count Cavour carried on the work. Finally Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, by annexing the Papal States for his own aggrandizement had accomplished the work.

American editors paid tribute to the "glory that had passed" in no uncertain terms. In the columns of the Chicago
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Daily Tribune we find the following:-

Great has been its duration, its glory transcendent ... He who makes himself familiar with the history of the Papacy will find himself acquainted with all the great movements of the race during the last twelve hundred years ... However much opposed, therefore one may feel on religious and political grounds to the Roman corporation he can scarcely suppress a tear of sympathy, as he contemplates the overthrow of that power, which growing up in silence and obscurity, amid the barbarian irruptions, lived on in undiminished vigor while mighty nations arose, culminated and fell by its side. 173

Others on the contrary, rejoiced at the "moribund fate of either civil or religious autocracy." 1870, marking the fall of the Catholic power was compared to the crisis of Chesma and Kugal which began the illness of the "Sick Man of Europe." It "appeared quite possible that in 1970 it may be said: What 1770 was to Mecca's prophet, 1870 was to Rome's Pontiff." The capture of Rome was heralded as the beginning of a new era for Italy. It was said that "'The Eternal City,' may take on a new life and recover something of its old grandeur and importance. That the civil and material progress which must ensue, will have an important effect upon the character and work of the Roman Church in Italy, cannot be reasonably doubted." By despoiling the Church of her temporal possessions, the new Italian State, had acquired large revenues which it was expected to use especially to disseminate education and to foster industrial and commercial

In 1865 editors had stated that the political greatness of Italy "depended in large measure upon her capability of becoming mistress of the Mediterranean ... of making the Mediterranean not, as the Napoleons intended it to be, a French lake, but emphatically and exclusively an Italian sea." However, England, not Italy eventually usurped the title and only at the present moment has the latter found it possible to take energetic steps to bring those waters under her control. One can scarcely refrain from calling those editors, who in 1870 prophesied that Italy would commence the work of reestablishing herself in the family of nations, enthusiastic optimists. The passing of years has proven that a World War was necessary before she could be numbered among the "Great Powers." Her internal development and external expansion has been delayed by European intrigue.

Midwestern editors, however, like the other members of their craft, were opposed to the Pope as a temporal sovereign rather than motivated by any animosity toward the incumbent of that office. When Pius IX entered upon his sacred duties and began his reign by making liberal concessions he was acclaimed by all. A letter to the Boston Advertiser quoted by the Detroit Free Press gives a very favorable and laudatory account of an interview with His Holiness. His "dignity and simplicity of
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manners," his friendly disposition toward the United States, his interest in the spiritual welfare as well as the temporal happiness of his subjects, his frugality of life and generosity to the poor, all these characteristics elicited a "feeling of respect" for him and the encomium of a "sincere and devout man of God." But his "bold reforming stand" despite the censure of "European despots" was the outstanding feature that was considered most deserving of praise. Especially the general amnesty, the curbing of money gifts from the masses, the reduction of the number of state officials, the regulations for sanitation, and the material improvements proposed, such as railroads, were enumerated as the most remarkable. 'Even his liberality to the Jews suffering from the inundations of the Tiber is cited. Nevertheless, even in 1847, the reason for this general approbation was evident. The amnesty proclaimed by Pius on the occasion of his accession was termed an "armistice to those imprisoned for heretical opinions," although it covered almost every possible case and released about a thousand political prisoners. His attempts to educate his people were noted as a means of "strengthening them for liberty, for which they were then being prepared." It was remarked that the Sovereign Pontiff was the most recent convert and espoused the Liberal Cause together with Piedmont and Tuscany; whereas ten million Italians
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of the total population of eighteen millions were still under the control of despotic governments. In brief, his praises were sung because Pius IX seemed to foster a cause for which many in Europe were sacrificing themselves, and one which was considered as particularly consonant with our political philosophy. Mature consideration of this situation, rendered by twentieth century authors is in agreement with the verdict of 1848, namely that Pius IX "more than all others ... contributed to the opening of the Revolution of Europe."

Within a few years all was reversed. After the revolution of 1848 and the suppression of the Roman Republic by means of French assistance it became apparent that the revolutionists were not prepared to accept amendments and reforms, but were determined to effect the abolition of existing institutions and the establishment of a new type of government. Hence Pius IX became a conservative. In addition, there arose the movement fostered by Cavour for the separation of Church and State. As has already been discussed, the dual nature of the office of Pope as spiritual and temporal sovereign was given greater prominence. So-called "neo Catholics" were expected to bring the Church "abreast of the age" and bring about the election of a pontiff, for example Cardinal d'Andrea, who would see the wisdom of "abandoning the little grandeur" and say to Victor Emanuel,

"this is a bit of property which my predecessors took from yours in troubous times. Take back your own bauble of a crown as King of Rome, and let there be peace." It was claimed that as successor to Peter, and following the precepts of Christ, Pius IX should be willing to surrender his temporal charge. When, on the contrary, he asserted his legitimate claims he was styled "solemn and obstinate," "a worldly man ... so accustomed to the exercise of political power and to the enjoyment of the emoluments of a temporal ruler, that it would be next to impossible for him to consent to be deprived of them for a long time." When the Pontiff exercised his spiritual jurisdiction, as many had exhorted him to do, that too called forth invective. Because Pius IX considered materialism, rationalism, and other "isms" of the age as a menace to Catholicism and had the courage or "audacity" to issue an encyclical contradicting the dictums of moderns, some editors regaled the public with choice bits of ridicule and scorn. As usual the Chicago Evening Journal was prominent. There we read:--

But, zounds and conscience! what an Encyclical His Holiness has sent us! The Holy Father is dreaming, or dozing, or doting. He has lost his reckoning. He forgets what century it is--thinks it is the morning of the eleventh when it is the afternoon of the nineteenth. He forgets what Anno Domini it is--thinks it is ten hundred and something or other, when it is clearly eighteen hundred and sixty-five. He takes aim with his bull at our side of the water--at Uncle Sam! He might as well aim it at the comet. Why, Pio

Nino (sic) must be joking, or disordered above the shoulders or between the arms, or he must be talking in his sleep, as the young lady says she is when she sings. To own the truth, though we wouldn't have it known to His Holiness for the world, Uncle Sam "smiles at the drawn dagger" of a bull, and "defies its point." 187

Climaxing Papal opposition to modern progressiveness was the summons to the Vatican Council. A translation of an article appearing in the Civiltà Cattolica, setting forth the reasons for its convocation and the impulses which directed the movement of public opinion in its regard was communicated to the Chicago Evening Journal by its Roman Correspondent. According to that transcript, ardent Catholics received it as a manifestation of Divine mercy and expected an "end to the immense disorders" in which the world was involved by the re-establishment of the fundamental principle of all order, that is, the submission of man to God's commandments and those commandments emanating from the authority He established on earth. Liberal Catholics on the other hand had an unfounded apprehension lest that assembly "strike too violently at modern society; ... scandalize the faithful, and impede the desire to conciliate the progress and civilization of the day with the doctrines and teaching of the gospel." A third class, impelled by "pride or ignorance, hate of the supernatural, or the fear that the Council would wield a terrible blow at Masonic institutions were provoked to wrath." In reality, according to the article, the Pope's intention was to curb the "passion for independence ... which originated in

men separating themselves from the Word of God, and conducts them to death, and ... which separates nations from this Word ... by impelling them to confide their future to governments in rebellion with God, ... Thus," the article continues, "we may consider a system of death, this combination of practical applications which are adorned by the fine names of modern civilization, modern progress, modern liberty, liberty of thought, human dignity, secularization and the like." Here was a summary of the systems of modern reformers, and a concise statement of the principal points of conflict with the Church. Since editors of the public press accepted that system, it is but natural that therein lay the true source of their opposition to whomsoever sustained their most formidable antagonist. Only the spirit of fairness or some motive of self-interest, as will be explained in a later chapter, could induce them to concede some good in their opponent.

Even radicals were animated at times by this spirit of honesty. In regard to the Allocution of Pius pronounced in the Consistory of the Vatican, June 23, 1867, the Chicago Evening Journal states:

Those who do not see in it a manifesto from the "Vicar of God" must still admit that it breathes a devout and sincere spirit, and as such it is worthy of commendation. Tinctured though it is with the prejudices and convictions of one in thorough sympathy with the traditions and claims of the Church at the head of which he has stood for the last twen-

ty-one years, it is truly catholic in sentiment. 189
This editor in the same article expressed his regret at the disas-
ters that had befallen the aging Pontiff and admitted the
healthy condition of the Roman Church. He based his opinion on
the fact that "there have been fewer conversions from that faith
to Protestantism during the last ten or twenty years than during
the same period of time since the days of Luther." Even the
Detroit Advertiser and Tribune granted that "there was no oc-
casion for language of vituperation in reference to the Pope, an
old man of amiable character and pure life" who had "neither the
disposition nor the ability to be a tyrant." Briefly the
sentiments toward Pius IX may be said to be an expression of
regret that he found himself in such situations. As an old man
"of piety" he was to be pitied not berated.
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CHAPTER IV. DEFENSE OF LIBERALISM.

Although historians may appear only to agree to disagree when defining the term, nevertheless there is a common consensus of opinion that there existed in Europe a movement which reached its acme during the nineteenth century and which can be called "Liberalism." One phase of this movement was given verbal expression by the "Declaration of the Rights of Man." This document of the Revolution was a proclamation of individual rights and liberties. It reflected the spirit of Rousseau, embodied the French Revolutionary principles, liberté, égalité, fraternité, and incorporated some provisions of the American Declaration of Independence and the British Magna Charta and Bill of Rights. Liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression were set down as inalienable rights of man. "Law," it defined as "the expression of the general will." "Every citizen," therefore had "a right to participate personally or through his representative in its formation."

There can be no doubt that the Declaration of the Rights of Man profoundly influenced the political thought and aspirations of the century. Using this declaration as a starting point, Liberalists constantly reiterated as the goal of their endeavors the principles of religious toleration, freedom of speech, liberty of the press, and representative government. All class superiority or distinction was taboo. Peoples as well
as individuals came to assert their right to be independent and to govern themselves. In short Liberalism was a reaction to authoritarianism. With principles such as these the editors of the Mid-West as well as the entire American press, were in perfect accord. Government "by consent of the governed" was the cornerstone of our republic, "a principle rejected alike by Emperors and Kings." In the expected contest between this principle and monarchy, editors declared that "the people of the United States" would be "on the side of Republican France, of Republican Germany, and Italy, and even of Republican England."

These directors of public opinion made no real distinction between European Liberalism and American Republicanism. American Republicanism as well as the French Revolution was declared a "landmark between ancient and modern thought" because both "proclaimed the rights of man as emphatically as the Reformation proclaimed those of conscience." These three, the Reformation, American Republicanism and the French Revolution were styled the "trinity of the ages, scattering far and wide the seeds of civil and religious liberty and releasing mankind from the thraldom of temporal and spiritual oppression." Americans admittedly were desirous of spreading republican principles, and any indication of an opportunity, no matter how

remote, for the achievement of these principles by European peoples, was carefully fostered and drawn to the attention of the American public. Republicanism was proclaimed the "moral shelter" of popular government, and so anxious were Americans in general for the establishment of republican institutions, that even editors said they were ready to interpret every reported demonstration as an act of rebellion against autocracy.

Comparing the situation in Europe and America in the middle of the century, we can state with some assurance that the principles espoused by the Liberalists of the Old World had been put into operation since the American Revolution in the New. Although the strength of our national existence was put to the test by the Civil war, there is no doubt that Americans in general were more prosperous than Europeans. Numerous political exiles, particularly from Germany and some from Italy, and poverty stricken, starving tenants from Ireland, who emigrated to our shores, made us more conscious of the advantages we possessed, and instilled the desire to promote the same conditions elsewhere. Wherever the principles of Liberalism were at stake, to that quarter the press of the Mid-West drew attention. Thus some, to whom Russia symbolized the despotism of Asia, characterized the European attack on her in 1853 as a struggle of Li-
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liberalism against absolutism. Allusions were frequently made in the fifties to the coming struggle between the "Absolutism of Asia," including under that term all forms of absolute government, and the "Liberalism of America." England, in the interim, was spoken of as the "salient angle in the Fortress of Liberty" because the despots of Eastern Europe found her the chief obstacle in their progress westward. She was considered to have made the greatest advance toward the doctrine held precious by Americans, namely, "that civil government can only be maintained on the basis of equality and universal suffrage." Her statesmen, it was said, did not "lead the people of the Realm to more enlarged views of men's rights," but at least, they "followed the masses with an apparently cheerful and honest cooperation in their purposes and designs." Hence, as the masses with greater education turned, so would England turn. Not so in other countries of Europe where by 1851 despotism was in the ascendancy. Louis Napoleon had converted his republican government into an empire, and in the Germanic Confederation the Austrian Empire, liberal agitation was again suppressed. With the passage of time, examples of England's advance toward Democracy were furnished. Bright and Gladstone were cited as illustrations of influential politicians working for the interests of

the masses. Meanwhile, the statesmen of other European countries sought the repression of their people. Continental Europe, developed its Bismarck, Napoleon, Francis Joseph and Nicholas of Russia.

Throughout all this propaganda, editors manifested a decided note of sincerity. After considering the influence of religious prejudice and the display of open hostility, one is apt to conclude that editors wrote of religious liberty only as opposed to the Catholic Church. Not so. To say that, "if the Prussian Government and the Prussian Chambers had any idea of religious liberty, they would not have objected to the readmission of the Jesuits" and within the same article to call that Order "Satanic" is undoubtedly a proof of religious tolerance. Again, when the Radical Democratic Party, an extremist organization under the direction of a certain Mr. Heinzen, issued a circular containing their platform, and therein stated that religious freedom ought "not to be allowed to Roman Catholics because their priests abuse it" the Chicago Daily Republican replied:— "while claiming the extremest freedom for himself and for the antagonists of all religious forms, Mr. Heinzen would deny any freedom to Roman Catholics. This will not do. If Mr. Heinzen is to be free to worship God or not worship Him, all in
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his own way, a Catholic layman, or a Catholic priest must have the same freedom."

Turning from the prospects of peacefully acquired liberal reforms in England, Liberalists focused attention on the Italian peninsula which was then divided into several petty states and presented the only possible point of attack on embattled monarchy. Throughout the period of the "Reaction," Mazzini had kept the land in constant turmoil with the result that by 1849 many had accepted the theory of unification and proposed various modifications. Piedmont was in the ascendancy, progressive and held "advanced" views, so that the unionists were finally convinced that she alone could be relied on to surmount the obstacles to a fusion of the people. Rome with her allies, Austria and France, constituted the greatest impediment.

Napoleon I had given Italy the first semblance of unity by making France the dominant power. With his fall and exile, Austria had supplanted French influence when Metternich through the Congress of Vienna placed Habsburg princes on several thrones and incorporated Lombardy-Venetia in the Austrian Empire. This then was the first objective of the agitators, to expel the Austrians and to reconquer the North. When Metternich fell from power, Rome in the midst of the revolution of '49, appealed to France and found Napoleon III ready to intervene. Here was the


second objective, namely to oust the French and make Rome the capital of Italy.

A Viennese journal supplied the editors with the information on how Austria regarded the proposed exchange of Lombardy-Venetia for other territory. She would object because the Italian provinces were fertile and well cultivated and the "quadrilateral" was not only a strong defense line against France but a protection for her Danubian provinces as well. Nevertheless, it was pointed out that Trieste and not Venice was the coming center of "Mediterranean traffic," and because of the large German element in its population, it was less exposed to Italian influences. Hence the opinion that Austria might relinquish her hold on northern Italy was deemed not altogether fanciful. The expense necessitated in retaining the provinces, the unsettled condition of the non-German portions of the Austrian Empire, and the aggressive policy of Prussia were advanced as arguments.

Furthermore, Austrian intrigue with France in the Zurich convention was noted as an actual attempt to barter for the state.

Results of the Austro-Prussian war were well summarized by the Chicago Daily Tribune as follows:

It left Prussia enriched by large accessions of territory, of population, of power and of military prestige; Italy, free from the presence of a hated oppressor, entrenched behind menacing fortifications; Austria humbled but still
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powerful, and beaten into a disposition to do justice to her subjects and to institute long needed reforms. Italy did not win much glory by her share in the war, to be sure, but, thanks to her ally's success, she attained her object. 209

This digest, likewise indicates the American attitude, namely, at last Austria was beaten into doing justice to her subjects. While making a few "liberal" concessions to the Slavic territories, she had estranged them the more, and "the wrongs she had heaped upon Italy and Hungary cried aloud for vengeance." That Austria ought to be "punished by somebody and punished scoundly" was declared to be the "common sentiment of Christendom." With the humiliation of Austria, the Pope it was true, suffered the loss of his most ardent supporter, but "civil and religious liberty alike received a great impetus."

Similar to that of Austria, was the score against France. Editors remarked that "in a republican country like the United States there never could by sympathy for Louis Napoleon." He was deemed by nature "hostile to republican institutions," and was held responsible for the invasion of Rome, contrary to his oath of office as president of a republic. Hence when the French armies entered the city of Rome, the Italians "very appropriately" suspended a quotation from the Constitution of
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France on their barricades. This extract read:—"It (the Republic) undertakes no wars for the purpose of conquest and never employs its armies against the liberty of any People." Editors did not mention whether the people as a whole or only the radical elements showed signs of hostility, but they did commend the action of civilians in annoying the French soldiers.

Moreover, they resented the fact that France not Piedmont first took Venetia from Austria and scorned the imperial demands for Nice and Savoy as compensation.

Finally, Napoleon III despite the manifestly Republican impulse of the people converted the Republic into an empire and shackled the Senate by the Senatus Consultum of July 14, 1866, thus "totally paralyzing" that popular branch of Government. Press laws, constantly increased in rigor, "silenced even the loudest reactionary declaimers." Only the Parisian youths, students at the University, voiced their dissatisfaction with the Napoleonic system and defended liberty against the encroachments of the Emperor. Hence when the Franco-Prussian War broke, editors rejoiced both for the sake of Italy and for the sake of
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France. They hesitated not in calling it a "struggle between Protestant, liberty and Catholic Absolutism."

We have already considered the general attitude of the press toward the Papacy, an attitude influenced by religious convictions. Now we shall consider another motive that directed editorial policies. As has been noted, editors were thoroughly imbued with the principles of liberty and independent self-government. To such writers the fact that the Papacy was allied to and sustained by France and Austria whom Liberalists and Republicans alike deemed despotic, was sufficient to antagonize them; but what was worse, they believed that in the estimate of the Church, "Liberty was heresy, independence rebellion." Liberalism was identified by many with the errors denounced in the Papal Encyclical of 1865, and Americans were "fighting for what the Pope was anathematizing."

Essentially the Church differed from the Liberal or Protestant view of religion. To her, religion was not a matter to be accepted or rejected by the individual conscience according to one's own inclinations as non-Catholics held, but rather it consisted in a revealed body of truth through which men were given a definitive creed. Hence it was only to be expected that

the public press would consider the Church as opposed to the principles of religious liberty and hostile to freedom of conscience. What was particularly hard for editors to accept was the Papal concept of the ideal state wherein the government protected religion and promoted its welfare. Even at the present day, the Papal appeal to the "secular arm" to enforce religious decrees, would be interpreted as intolerance. Hence it is not surprising that the Austrian laws placing marriage and education under civil authorities were deemed an "achievement of Liberal principles over religious intolerance."

Furthermore the Papacy seemed set against civil liberties because these came in conflict with religious tenets. Thus the Pontifical allocution on the Austrian decrees was said to "shock every friend of civil and religious liberty throughout the world." These civil rights were given expression in constitutionalism, and republicanism, which, as has already been indicated, were rejected by Rome. Hence Great Britain was commended for the suggestion she made in 1849 in response to the appeal from Pius IX, that reconciliation could be best effected.

228. Chicago Daily Tribune, Feb. 3, 1866, "Correspondence from Italy."
229. Chicago Daily Tribune, July 18, 1868, "The Pope's Allocu-
tion"—editorial.
between the Pope and his subjects by a guarantee to "maintain the
corstitution and republican system of government he had granted
previously, or by the separation between the spiritual authority
and the temporal powers and institutions." Moreover, Rome
was undoubtedly the greatest obstacle to the unification of
Italy and therefore the antagonist of Italian Nationalism.
"Papal supremacy" has declined one editor wrote, "in precisely
the same ratio as the spirit of liberty has revived among the
Italians and they have crystallized into a new nation."
Therefore Rome as the type of arbitrary power, was the "enemy
of Progress and Freedom." Since the Pope as absolute ruler
was a purely ecclesiastical institution and since the Papa-
cy was inconsistent with modern political systems the fall
of Rome was considered as an occasion of "rejoicing for friends
of human liberty and free government."

On the other side of the stage stood Piedmont. Mazzini,
Garibaldi and Cavour were the heroes of liberty and repub-
licanism. Joseph Mazzini had spent his life for the "Revolu-
tion" in Italy but due to the machinations of Napoleon III was

---

editorial.
231. Chicago Daily Republican, Nov. 24, 1866, "The Pope"—editorial.
233. Chicago Daily Republican, Oct. 4, 1870, "The Roman Plebis-
cite"—editorial.
234. Chicago Daily Tribune, Dec. 22, 1866, "The Temporal Power of
the Pope"—editorial.
235. Chicago Evening Journal, Sept. 15, 1870, "The Italians
Secure Rome"—editorial.
forced even as an invalid to spend his days in exile. This "noble character" was acclaimed one of the "greatest and best and unquestionably the most fitted of Italian statesmen," "one of the foremost champions of human progress and freedom."

Italian Liberalists demanded his recall from exile in order to bestow upon him "just recognition" of his labors in their behalf by admitting him to the new Italian Parliament, but France opposed and Piedmont annulled the election. He alone had learnt from the study of Italian history the lesson of the inadvisability of relying on foreign powers for aid, but his pleas were unheard. However, even then amidst all this applause some editors took exception. Mazzini's agents had undermined the fidelity of the army, and his religious opinions were "unacceptable to materialists and evangelical Christians alike."

Recent judgment on the Republican movement as fostered by Mazzini is in accord with the latter group and has condemned his methods as unpractical and visionary.

Historians have linked the name of Garibaldi with that of Mazzini as one of the liberators of Italy. In America, the
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Mid-West was not reserved in expressions of esteem. He was called the "attorney of liberty" and a "great revolutionary leader," whose claim to greatness was his "passionate love of country." Garibaldi and his redshirts were hailed as the real patriots of Italy, who were ready to draw their swords in defense of Liberty which had been betrayed by Pius IX. Indeed, so enthusiastic was one editor, that he succumbed to the vogue of the day and saw fit to print a thirty three line account of a phrenologist's conclusions. His residence in the United States, especially his action in shunning "all intercourse with American snobs and courting that of genuine freemen" was advanced as the basis of mutual esteem. Sympathy was expressed when he was rejected by the King and was forced to retire to Caprera. England's repudiation of this hero was termed "about the most shabby thing the public prints have been called
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The Daily Chicago Times gave the following as an explanation of the action of official requesting Garibaldi to leave England:

The true reason underlying this strange proceeding on the part of the English people is that the Danish Conference was about to meet in London, and it was deemed inexpedient to be feting at the same time a man who would hourly offend Russia by his Polish sympathies, Austria and Prussia by his outspoken predilections in favor of Denmark, and France by his warm fraternization with the radical Mazzini.

Republican papers generally expressed a high regard for Garibaldi, whereas the Democratic organs were not so consistent. Thus because of Garibaldi's letter to radical elements, the Detroit Free Press parted company and made him a subject of ridicule, and ridicule was turned to scorn when this "hero of liberty" voiced religious prejudices and objected to Spaniards admitting priests to the exercise of universal suffrage.

Cavour, the third member of the Italian Liberators was in similar fashion regarded as a "fast friend of representative government, the freedom of the press, toleration in religion, education of the people, Italian unity, and Italian independence."

Here in a few words we have the real reason why editors so consistently gave their unqualified approval to the
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policies of Piedmont. Representation in government, freedom of speech, religious toleration and public education were the American interpretation of Liberty and Republicanism. Rome, as we have already discussed, was conceived to be the model of despotism; whereas Piedmont, the leader of the Italian people, was consecrated to the cause of freedom and progress. The program was clearly defined in editorial offices, namely to promote the regeneration of the masses and unity with independence. Nor was this strange. Inspired by the struggle for maintaining the Union on this continent, many felt a bond of sympathy with the Italian people professedly engaged in establishing unity on their peninsula. But more than that, it was considered "not merely a war for the establishment of Italian unity, but for the vindication of modern civilization." National pride also suggested that Italians looked "toward the United States as the model nation on earth." Napoleon's "prediction that 'in fifty years, Europe would be Republican or Cossack'" seemed about to be realized, and toward that realization Italy led the van of the army of liberation. Some admitted that the belligerents of Europe were not contending for republicanism in the complete American sense of the term, but the guise of royalty in Piedmont "was loosely worn" and there were "aspirations that
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nothing but a republic, modeled not so much after the ancient form native to the soil, as after our own, could gratify."

Setbacks were recognized, but these were deemed only temporary and it was expected they would eventually be eliminated. Editors did not attempt to deny the presence of anti-ecclesiastical laws, nor did they claim that these accorded with religious freedom. The so-called program of a Free Church in a Free State, as actually put into practice, was severely criticized, and the complaint was made that "administrators appointed by the Government received handsome salaries out of the revenues of the Church for doing next to nothing."

It was clearly understood that reforms were necessary in the ministry of finance. The budget deficit was attributed to needless expenditures on parasites operating under "the pretexts of being intendants and commissioners." To avert financial bankruptcy the Piedmontese government was obliged to sell the tobacco monopoly. In consequence of the burdens imposed by heavy taxes riots occurred. Finally, the method of supplying the deficit by spoliation of Church property was

82.
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roundly condemned. Nevertheless the people were reported to have displayed their patriotism by making voluntary contributions of their treasured articles to relieve the financial stringency. Similar confusion reigned in the other ministries due to the numerous parties then extant and inefficient administration.

Although the atmosphere was clouded, the editors saw a ray of light. The Piedmontese government erred through inexperience, Unfit candidates were at times proposed, the people were as yet not accustomed to self government, and, in general disorganization was to blame. The new kingdom was slowly progressing and the Liberal party was in the ascendancy. Despite the difficulties of the situation several improvements had been inaugurated. Sanitation was being improved.
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railroads were being built, and brigandage was gradually being suppressed. It was considered possible and the hope expressed that Italy would become the leading power of the Mediterranean so that ultimately it might be linked with the United States "by more direct and intimate commercial intercourse of the two nations already allied by mutual esteem and admiration."
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CHAPTER V. PATRIOTISM AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS.

Editors of the Mid-West were guided by religious convictions and principles of Liberalism in forming their judgment of the Italian situation, but besides these, patriotic sentiments and political affiliations played an important role. France and Austria, the allies of the Papacy, and finally the Papacy itself, were guilty of diplomatic intrigue that crossed the current of American aspirations.

Since the inauguration of the "Manifest Destiny" program, Mexico and Cuba were the "danger zones" that could embroil the United States in conflict. After 1850, then, European nations, whose diplomacy involved invasion of these "zones" were considered not merely as violators of our Monroe Doctrine but also as poachers upon our own "restricted areas." While the United States was engaged in a Civil War, Napoleon III of France set up an empire in Mexico with an Austrian prince as the regent. England also had her "fingers in the pie," and she displayed as little sympathy with the North as her rival across the channel; nevertheless, she was not regarded as a real menace. Editors were fully aware of the fact that the English were jealous of our progress, and when in 1854 the North British Review gave expression to the opinion that "our transatlantic cousins gave expression to the opinion that "our transatlantic cousins..."
will become a trifle less insolent and overbearing when they find that the fleet which summers in the Baltic, can, without cost or effort winter in the Gulf of Mexico," it was quoted with comments of resentment. England had begun her policy of "splendid isolation," according to which she maintained a neutral stand until the fortunes of war forecast the victor. Some editors penetrated the labyrinth of diplomacy and did not hesitate to reveal their findings. The Milwaukee Sentinel made the following comparative study:

England certainly has no love for us; and her aristocracy would rejoice in our utter disintegration, but her statesmen realize the expensiveness of a quarrel with this country, and have no desire to get involved in one.

The French Emperor, on the other hand has entered upon a career of conquest on this continent, and has succeeded in overrunning Mexico with his army, and wants to hold it as a permanent province. He knows that the Monroe doctrine has become unalterably fixed in the creed of the American people, that when the Union is restored the first exercise of its power will be to enforce this doctrine in Mexico, and that his only chance of retaining his conquests there rests on the permanent dismemberment of the Union. Given this state of affairs, with an immense army and navy and an absolute ruler without conscience or restraint, and it is easy to see what policy is likely to be pursued.

Lord Palmerston, the personification of the Victorian Compromise, was considered as the willing accomplice of Louis Napoleon; his "disposition to oblige the emperor bordered upon servility."

Some suspected that the affair in Mexico was the result of "mutually preconcerted" action. "To give his interference in Mexico something of a legitimate appearance, Napoleon required

allies whom he could afterwards discard, and in both of these
objects Palmerston, the soul of the British government, lent him
a willing hand."

Napoleon III, the "dictator of Europe," on the other
hand, "wantonly defied the United States," "and jumped our
claim" in Mexico, which "we had come to consider as an inheri-
tance sure to become useful" because it afforded us the "shortest
route to the Pacific, and apparently a natural outlet for our
growing population." The danger of the situation lay in the
fact, as was indicated, that if France "got firmly settled in
that nest it would be hard to oust her and she could prove a
dangerous ally of England." Others felt that Napoleon inter-
vened in Mexico because he expected the Confederacy to triumph,
and he saw an opportunity to establish an empire subservient to
himself and thus add to his own prestige. Moreover after
the Civil War fugitives from the Union crossed the Rio Grande,
and it was feared that these might involve us in another war.
Both France and the United States were making ominous prepara-
tions; men-of-war lay at the mouth of the Rio Grande; Brownsville
was occupied by Federal troops and Matamoras by Imperial
forces backed by French contingents. Taking all these circum-
stances into account, it became clear that the situation was
becoming increasingly tense and that action must be taken to
prevent a war.
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stances into consideration it was but natural that the American attitude would be:— "The Mexican Empire must fall; the French must leave the country; and Maximilian must return home."

Most editors wrote in favor of intervention, but all consistently advocated that an American expedition was not a war of aggression but rather a defense of the Monroe Doctrine. Although some advocated a Republic of Mexico on the principles of liberty, others took umbrage at the military leaders who "appeared to think less of conquering Maximilian than filling their own pockets," and gave them the opprobrious title of "mongrels."

Hence it was almost inevitable that the directors of public opinion should be convinced that Napoleon III was "the most dangerous foe of the United States and of free institutions all over the world."

Austria, likewise, was by this Mexican episode placed in an unenviable position. Instructions were forwarded by Sec-

retary Seward to Mr. Motley, our minister at Vienna, to vacate his post in the event that Austria sent troops to Mexico to assist the sovereign. Maximilian, the puppet emperor, was not received favorably by the press, as long as he was secure, but when his throne was tottering, hostility, though still present, was at least somewhat softened. He was described during the latter period as neither an ambitious nor brilliant man; a man personally estimable who doubtless sought to rule wisely and beneficently. In brief, the French escapade in Mexico proved disastrous to France and Austria, because it alienated the United States from these two countries. Because the Pope depended upon the good will of these states, it was but an added reason why editors opposed his cause.

Misguided patriotism was another factor in determining editorial attitudes. An illustration of this is the attack on Pius IX provoked by his correspondence with the Bishops of the United States and Jefferson Davis in the interests of peace. A translation of the letter to Archbishop Hughes, dated Rome, Oct. 18, and that addressed to the President of the Confederate States, dated Rome, Dec. 3, 1863, together with copies of the letter of Davis to Pius IX, dated Richmond, Sept. 23, 1863 and
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the instructions to A. Dudley Mann, Commissioner of the Confederacy to Belgium, are printed in the Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia. A careful scrutiny of this correspondence will bring the unbiased investigator to the conclusion that His Holiness was acting in the traditional role of mediator of peace. Nevertheless one letter is addressed "to the Illustrious and Honorable Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States of America." This was interpreted as addressed to the "monarch of a new nation;" in other words a recognition of the Confederacy.

According to international law a central government engaged in suppressing a domestic insurrection is entitled to an immunity from interference. Insurrection becomes warfare in the international sense only when the central government has been compelled to resort to military force. Recognition of belligerency by foreign powers is warranted under these conditions:

First: The conflict must be a public war, i.e. a state of war, in which a considerable portion of the population is engaged, and not merely the existence of armed bodies coming into occasional conflict.

Second: There must be some assurance of the success of the insurgent cause.

Third: The insurgents must have proved their ability

---

to maintain themselves within a definite territory and must have acquired a de facto political organization so as to be enabled to enter into diplomatic intercourse.

Whether the correspondence of Pius IX was an actual or even virtual recognition of the confederacy, may be transmitted, for that is debatable. However, it can be maintained that recognition was justifiable. "The Federal Government had already accorded belligerent rights to the insurgents by its avowed determination to attempt the suppression of the rebellion by a resort to the use of its land and naval forces and by its conduct of the military operations in accordance with the laws of war." Furthermore, in the Supreme Court decisions concerning the brig, Amy Warwick, and other blockade runners, the majority opinion as enunciated by Mr. Justice Grier read: "that a blockade de facto actually existed, and was formally declared and notified by the President on the 27th and 30th of April 1861, is an admitted fact in these cases." From this it may be concluded that Pius IX was justified in recognizing the Confederate States, if it be maintained that he actually or virtually did so.

Nevertheless, it was ill-advised because it was interpreted as an offense to the government of the Union. Republicans
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called it an "infamous proceeding" of an "old man upon a tottering throne, intended to enlist the sympathies of Roman Catholics on the side of the mediaeval banner of slavery and the south." Democrats, themselves "infamous Copperheads," considered it a "letter of courtesy, with a gentle prayer for peace and reconciliation." In short, the radical elements were confirmed in their opinion by the correspondence referred to above. When Pius IX and his Prime Minister made contributions to the Sanitary Fair held in New York for the benefit of Union soldiers they passed it over in silence. Perhaps it resembled too much a proof of the Pope's impartiality and might disprove the assertion of his sympathy with "slavery." At least that is the suggestion of the Chicago Evening Post.

A further instance of such motivation by patriotism was the question of the defense of the Union. Under the leadership of Greeley's Tribune republican papers attempted to create the impression that Catholics were identified with the rebellion and did not render services in the Union army. The charge was made that "the vast political influence of that (Roman Catholic) church in America has always been cast for slavery and
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that in the war for the Union its hostility to the abolition of slavery rendered it a bulwark of moral aid and sympathy to the rebellion." Democratic editors repeatedly referred to the activity of the Catholic Church throughout the ages for the abolition of slavery. They maintained that "the Catholic pulpits," even those of the South, "did not proclaim treason from Sabbath to Sabbath," "whereas the Northern Protestant Churches which followed in the wake of political and military events only denounced slavery within the last few years, when it was politic and safe to do so." Furthermore, they not only cited the war record of the Sisters of Mercy and Catholic chaplains, but also asserted that "the members of no other denomination more freely offered their lives to defend the union during the rebellion." No doubt can be entertained about the record of priests and nuns, but there was doubt that it was equally true of the laity. The argument of Orestes A. Brownson seemed very convincing to some:-

In vain should we appeal to the Telegraph and Advocate, the New York Tablet, and the Pittsburg Catholic, for these journals have not been uniformly anti-slavery or decidedly loyal, and at best are only exceptions, and by no means fair exponents of the sentiments and opinions of the Catholic body in the United States. In vain should we appeal to the large number of Catholic volunteers in the army, for that number, as large as it has been or even is, we are told by Archbishop Hughes, is not relatively so large as is the proportion of Catholics to the whole population of the loyal states, and besides, it may be said that the mass of them volunteered not from loyalty, but for the sake of the high

bounties and liberal pay offered, and in the case of the Irish, for the purpose of acquiring military experience and distinction, to be turned to account in a war against Great Britain for the liberation and independence of Ireland. 305

Having considered the appeal to patriotism made particularly by Republican papers, we can proceed to analyze the influence of party politics on editors. Before the War of Rebellion, the Democratic party had been aligned with the Southern planter while the Republicans, organized in opposition to the Kansas-Nebraska Act, continued in existence after that issue faded, by aligning themselves with the moneyed class of the East. Immigrants for various reasons, too many even to be enumerated here, divided themselves among the two political factions generally along the lines of nationality. The Irish, for the most part Catholics, followed the banner of the Democrats, whilst the Germans, many of them political exiles, found the Republicans more congenial. When the Civil War broke, the Democratic South constituted the "Rebels;" whereas the Democrats of the North became the Copperheads. Republicans, though conservative under the leadership of Lincoln, soon after his inauguration divided into two factions. The radical elements or "Black Republicans" had as their objective to obtain political dominance at all costs. For them the war became a punitive measure and not merely a struggle to preserve the union. After the war they sought to enfranchise the negro in order to maintain their supremacy in the South; in the North they attempted to unite under their flag all

non-Catholics by stirring up sentiment against the Irish immigrants who had become the chief support of the Democratic Party.

No doubt can be entertained as the political nature of the newspapers of the era. Personally editors may not have always been loyal to their party, but the tone of their editorials betrays their sympathies. If there could be any case of mistaken identity we have only to scan the pages of their rivals in the journalistic field and there we would find frequent scathing remarks or even entire articles devoted to enlightening the public about their opponents. Then too, from time to time, the editors published a brief history of their paper or a prospectus of its future.

An insight into the programs of the political parties will generally give an indication of what will be found in the editorials. Republican editors pointed out that Democratic papers catered to the Catholic vote and feared a Puritan persecution, whereas the Democrats charged that the Republicans were exploiting the Franco-Prussian War in order to win the Ger-


Both were right. Catholics were considered a menace, and Thaddeus Stevens and his cohorts did their level best to suppress them. In their defense the Detroit Free Press ran a series of articles, and other papers followed suit.

It was the day of the Beechers, the Cheevers, and the Hatfields. The pulpit was aligned with a political party, and the editors with the sects and the parties. "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion," the phrase that terminated the political life of James Gillespie Blaine in 1884, was alive and influenced editorial policies long before that date. "Rum," the bogey of Methodists and many others, can be taken as the slogan of the extremists. It typifies the spirit that found the Catholics lacking in righteousness and invoked the famous "blue laws." This and "Romanism," the battle cry of the liberalists, account for the religious bigotry, the anti-clerical and anti-papal sentiment that so often prevailed. "Rebellion" explains itself.
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It was the watchword of the narrow-minded, selfish, ruthless radicals, the self-styled patriots who sought to rally the aforementioned to their banner. Thus in three words we have a summary of the factors that directed the policy of Mid-Western editors.
### #1. Population of Chicago.

**Estimate, June 1, 1865.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population 1860</th>
<th>1865</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>43,417</td>
<td>61,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>81,129</td>
<td>94,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>48,618</td>
<td>53,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>109,260</td>
<td>207,066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the last Census (Republican--1865)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>805,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>585,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>288,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>212,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>179,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>177,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### #2. Circulation of Chicago newspapers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribune (sic)</td>
<td>$353,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are disputed by the *Chicago Daily Journal* of the same period, but no corrected figures are offered.

---


APPENDIX B.

"At this present date, anyone who starts to write about the Risorgimento may think himself fortunate in one respect, namely, that since the settlement with the Church he can express his views more freely than heretofore without fear of reopening vexed questions. For a long time the 'Roman Question' remained a living issue of unusual bitterness. In Italy, of late years, the leading historians—notably Masi—have tended to take a broadminded view of the situation."

"One reason for this is that until lately the old ruling families and the Pope were still regarded as dangers to the unity of Italy, and consequently they often received little sympathy from historians: whereas now the old rulers are forgotten and the Vatican question is settled. Moreover, as the lesser rulers were all dispossessed by the Risorgimento, it would have damped (sic) the joy in the national triumph to point out that in most cases this dispossession was a tragedy. Yet it was true; but it was inevitable, if Italy was ever to become a nation."

---

Foreign Items.

Mr. Odo Russell, the nephew of Earl Russell and the diplomatic agent of Gen. Pellain in Rome recently transmitted the following information to Lord Clarendon, Viscount Palmerston's successor in the Foreign Office:

"Travellers visiting the Pope's dominions should be very careful not to bring forbidden books or Colt's revolvers with them, the custom house officers having strict orders to confiscate them, and it is not always possible to recover them after the owners have left the Roman States. Forbidden books are those condemned by the Congregation of the Index, books on religion or morality in general, political and philosophical works of every description, and more especially Italian religious tracts published in London. But above all, travellers should be careful not to bring English, American, Italian or other Bibles with them, the Bible being strictly prohibited."

"Upon which Mr. Punch addresses His Holiness, on the 10th inst., in the following strain:

2. Ibid., II, xvi.
"From our dominions we exclude--
(Urbi et orbis Papa vindex)--
All Colt's revolvers, and that brood
Of Satan--books named in the Index.

"Books on the Church (St. Peter's mystery),
The State (St. Peter's principality);
Books upon politics and history,
Books on religion and morality.

"Tracts, one and all, but chief therein,
Such as are in Italian written,
And printed in that seat of sin
And hold of heresy, Great Britain.

"Above all, ye, of every nation
Who seek the sacred soil of Rome
Be warned, if ye'd escape confiscation,
Your Bibles must be left at home.

"No matter what the tongue or text is,
By whom translated, when, or where;
The Bible upon no pretext is
Allowed to pass St. Peter's Chair.

"Wise Pope--that Peter's seat guard'est well,
'Gainst heretics' invasion free--
With the dove's innocense how well
The serpent's wisdom shows in thee!

"While Popes remain doubt's sole resolvers,
Sole founts of truth, sole whips of sin,
What use in keeping out revolvers,
If Revolution's self's let in?

"What all the Colts that e'er exploded,
All Garibaldi's guns and swords,
To the live shells, time-fused and loaded
Between the plainest Bible boards?

"What Revolution into ruins
So like to hurl St. Peter's dome,
As God's word gauged with Papal doings,
The Bible face to face with Rome."

On Sunday last, a number of the clergymen of this city preached sermons tending to show that the Roman Catholic church aimed at political and religious supremacy in this country, and that its existence and increase menaced our republican system of government. In other cities much has lately been said by clergymen of evangelical denominations on this question, and preachers of what is termed liberal Christianity have joined in the discussion. Sunday newspapers, both political and religious, have also taken up the matter, and have treated it very seriously, and as if there were good reasons to apprehend a domination by the Roman Catholic church in our governmental affairs.

The publicity and prominence which have recently been given to such fears would indicate that the church against whom such war is made has lately given some evidence of the purpose attributed to it, and thus caused fresh alarm in all sections of the country. As yet, however, no proof has been presented that the pope, or any persons acting under him, contemplate any change in the policy or management of the church, so far as this country is concerned, or intend to do aught else than "keep the even tenor of their way" in the conduct of their religious interests confided to their charge, and with which they are peculiarly identified and interested.

The Catholic Church, in common with all others, is working, and perhaps more zealously than the majority of other denominations, to enlarge its numbers, to plant itself in new fields, to extend its influence and power, and bring men into subjection to its doctrines and authority; but its past history in this country affords no warrant for the belief that it aspires to control of the government. Indeed, in the bitter and turbulent partisan warfare which convulsed the nation during our late civil war, and which caused such angry and vindictive feelings that our newspapers daily recorded murders on account of political opinions, that church kept itself above the political strife raging around it, and confined itself strictly to its appropriate religious functions. The members of no other denomination more freely offered their lives to defend the union during rebellion, and that political system, and those principles of religious freedom for plotting the overthrow of which the church now stands charged. In this country political issues have not been dragged into the pulpits of the Catholic church to the exclusion of Christianity, and under her altars political hatreds have not been lashed into a fury which made men ripe for deeds of blood.

The influence, may, even the absolute authority, which the church has exercised in other times and other governments, and its aforetime haughty claim of a right to dictate in civil government as well as in matters pertaining
only to religion, form no foundation whatever for the charge
that Roman Catholicism now contemplates the establishment
of an empire here which will be supreme in political and
religious affairs. The attempt to fasten upon it such a
purpose by quoting its history hundreds of years ago is dab-
bling in sophistry to sustain a groundless charge, and is
an attempt to stir up animosity against a religious body in
a way of which Christians and gentlemen ought to be ashamed.
The fact is plain that the authority of the Church in civil
governments is daily diminishing in the only European
nations where it attempts to exercise such authority.

Our Christian friends suffering from fear of Roman
Catholic supremacy in this country may dismiss their fore-
bodings. The Church will enlarge its borders, and root
itself more firmly as the years go by, sustained and stren-
thened by such fanatical zeal as made Loyala (sic) immortal,
and has conferred dignity on the crimes of Jesuitism. It
will win golden opinions from candid opponents by apostles
whose lives of self-sacrifice will compare with those of
LaSalle and Marquette.

#4. Is Protestantism in Danger?
Dr. Hatfield wound up his sensational sermon last Sunday
evening as follows:

"I weigh now my words—I understand what I am saying—
when I remind you that you have an emissary of Rome, a spy,
in almost every Protestant family, and if the time should
ever come when the interests of the Church should need an
assassin in every Protestant family, Rome knows where to find
one, and how to put her hands upon one. Unwilling as you
may be to look this matter in the face, a matter which
politicians are ignoring, you must know that the success of
the Catholic Church is the overthrow of your free institu-
tions. Never in my life have I spoken on any subject with
a stronger conviction of the truth of what I have said, and
of my utterances made in your hearing tonight ...

#5. Religious Intolerance.

There is at times nothing for which the public are more
grateful than being treated to a good panic. That this
secret is well known, even to the conductors of certain re-
ligious journals must have been seen from the Springfield
Republican's editorial, republished in Sunday's Free Press
where the mischievous and wicked work in which the Boston
Recorder and the Methodist are at the present engaged has
thoroughly exposed. These beacons of godliness and grace
evidently desire to get up a sectarian war, now that the
sectional one is disposed of, and for this purpose, they
preach a crusade against the Catholics and the Pope. They

pretend that there is a deep plot on the part of the Roman Hierarchy to destroy our free institutions, to make their religion the State religion, to elect in 1868 a President, two thirds of both houses of Congress, a majority of the Governors, and to establish a despotism with the pope for its Head!

Did we not live in an age which not withstanding its boasted progress and enlightenment, is likewise an age of impudent deceptions; an age of extraordinary knowledge, and of marvelous ignorance; an age of daring scepticism, and of blind credulity, where nothing is too difficult for ingenuity to accomplish, or too absurd for folly and ignorance to believe—we might smile at the idea of conjuring up such spectres in broad day light. But though the day of the traditional Belzebub with his orthodox hoofs, horns, and tail has passed, the poor old man that holds the key of St. Peter with infirm hands, and will perhaps soon have no place where to rest his venerable head, still continue to frighten certain super protestant people. It is for this reason that the ridiculous accusations of these sectarian sheets cannot be treated with the contempt which they merit, but must be met and exposed at the outset ...
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