

PIUS IX SAYS "NO" TO THE LIBERAL CATHOLICS

The liberal Catholics were a group of brilliant thinkers and writers who contributed much to the remarkable Catholic re, viva! of the early nineteenth century. Unlike many of their confreres, they were optimistic about the direction of the post-revolutionary world. They wanted the Church to abandon its state of siege mentality and get down to the task of finding a more positive relationship with the liberal secular culture. Above all, they wanted the Church to get behind the liberals in their efforts to create parliamentary regimes based on constitutionally guaranteed freedoms, including freedom of religion. Their first setback occurred when their ideas were condemned by Pope Gregory XVI and their leader, Lamennais, deserted them. The advent of his successor, the reputedly liberal Pius IX, revitalized the liberal Catholic movement. But Pius lacked any sympathy with liberalism and proved unable to find a *modus vivendi* with their doctrines. All hopes of finding one were dashed when he got locked in combat with the Italian liberals who wanted to liberate his own Papal States. Unable to withstand their superior military strength, he turned his spiritual weapons on them and condemned the whole ideology of liberalism in his *Syllabus of Errors* (1864). It effectively squelched the liberal Catholics and hardened the Church in its long-standing state of siege mentality in regard to modern liberal secular culture.

The era that began with the downfall of Napoleon witnessed a full-scale revival of the Catholic Church, a spiritual and intellectual renaissance that made it once more a vital institution and a powerful force in public affairs. It was an amazing reversal. The revolutionary period saw the Church stripped of its privileges, its Pope imprisoned, its property confiscated, its monasteries emptied, its priests and nuns slaughtered and driven into exile, its very existence called into question. And even though it was propped up again by Napoleon, it was treated by the Corsican adventurer as his handmaid: He humiliated the papacy, considered

the bishops his creatures, even rewrote the Church's catechism and dictated the discipline it was to follow.

But after Waterloo the Church returned to health and vigor. The heroic refusal of Pius VII to bend the knee to Napoleon won the admiration of Europe, and the papacy's renewed moral authority helped Consalvi to win back the Papal States at the Congress of Vienna. An astonishing sign of the Church's vitality was the reestablishment of the Jesuit Order in 1814. It soon numbered recruits in the thousands and extended its organization into most of the Catholic countries of Europe. Many new religious orders sprang up, such as the Marianists and the Society of the Sacred Heart; empty seminaries started to fill up, and the churches were crowded. The Society of the Foreign Missions was re-established in 1815, and together with the Jesuits it helped to rekindle missionary zeal. This spiritual awakening brought many Catholics back to lives of prayer and sacrifice, and the Christian virtues were practiced to a heroic degree by souls like John Vianney, the Cure of Ars, who revitalized the French clergy by his example and drew huge numbers of penitents to his confessional. Likewise St. Clement Maria Hofbauer, the Redemptorist, inspired a revival of Church life in southern Germany.

There was also an intellectual side to the Catholic revival. Many European thinkers turned away from the skepticism and rationalism of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment: They regarded its view of human nature as superficial, and they could no longer accept its mechanistic view of the universe and its idea of the mind as something like a calculating machine. After the savage wars and irrational fury of the French Revolution, which culminated in the futile bloodbaths of Napoleon, they were skeptical about the dogma of progress and the simple goodness of human nature. They found Diderot's and Voltaire's system of values simplistic and searched for a view of life that made greater allowance for such needs as faith, reverence, mystery, and respect for tradition. Some of them had already found it in the Vicomte de Chateaubriand's *The Genius of Christianity* (1802)-a hymn to the aesthetic glories of the Catholic Church-and many followed him

back to the Church, A good number of renowned intellectuals around Europe took the same path and converted to romanticism, political reaction, and the Catholic faith. The outstanding thinker of this group was Friedrich von Schlegel, who saw "tradition as the expression of a slow evolution ripened in the womb of time, a work not of arbitrarily deciding reason, but of mysteriously working life."¹ He idealized the Holy Roman Empire and dreamed of a European confederation under the Pope. Of equal importance was Joseph von Gorres, who put his exceptional journalistic talents to the service of the papacy and the German Catholic Church.

It was during this period of its extraordinary revival that the Catholic Church was first confronted squarely with the momentous question of how it was going to relate to liberalism-the new political movement that espoused the ideals of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. It was a question that would agitate Christians and especially Catholics for nearly a century and divide the Church into two sharply opposed blocs.

Liberalism drew its supporters largely from the rising middle and professional classes. They wanted a parliamentary system of government based on a written constitution that would guarantee personal rights, including freedom of religion. Rationalists and secularists in regard to religion, they opposed the Church's control over such matters as marriage and education-an approach not calculated to win them many friends among churchmen.

The period after Waterloo (1815-30) was a time of trial for the liberals. The monarchs restored by the Congress of Vienna dusted off their thrones and sat tight. They surrounded themselves with conservative statesmen like Metternich, the Austrian minister, who lent his name to the era, a man whose main concern was to keep the ghost of the French Revolution from rising again. He saw Jacobins and liberals under every bed and radical students in every disturbance. To squelch revolutionary ideas he used a secret police, censorship of books, and watchdogs at the universities.

With men like Metternich firmly in control everywhere, the liberal cause seemed hopeless. The autocratic Habsburgs controlled the destinies of Middle Europe from the Baltic to Sicily. The Prussian

King, it is true, toyed, at first, with the idea of granting a constitution to his subjects, but when Karl Sand, a young theological student, assassinated an agent of the Russian Czar, he and the other German rulers were persuaded by Metternich to issue the Carlsbad Decrees, which greatly tightened the control of the secret police over the universities. Liberals everywhere were forced into hiding.

The conservative backlash struck very hard in Spain, where Ferdinand VII arrested all prominent liberals, re-established the Inquisition, and ordered the restitution of all ecclesiastical and feudal property confiscated under Napoleon. In France, the restored Bourbon King Louis XVIII showed surprising talent at first in steering a course between the right and the left; but the profound cleavage between the two finally made moderation impossible, and he and his successor, Charles X, gradually veered to the right. Even in England reaction held sway. Parliament in 1819 passed the Six Acts-the most repressive laws enacted in that country for generations. The thought behind them was expressed by the Duke of Wellington: "Our example will render some good in France as well as in Germany, and we must hope that the whole world will escape the universal revolution which seems to menace us all."

Nurturing no love for the liberals, the Christian Churches allied themselves solidly with the monarchs and the nobles in their efforts to restore the old order. The word "revolution" held no charms for the clergy. In England the Methodists did yeoman service in drawing the lower classes away from revolutionary ideas. The Catholic clergy, who for the most part had good reason to hate the Revolution, preached the gospel of obedience to the established order in season and out, although in a few countries-Ireland, Poland, and Belgium-the clergy played an important role in stirring up discontent. In France, the clergy showed special zeal in the cause of reaction. In concluding religious missions they would sometimes burn the works of Voltaire and administer an oath to all present to maintain religion and legitimate government. In the Papal States, the reactionaries took over after the death of the moderate Pius VII in 1823 and the retirement of his Secretary of State, Consalvi. The Curia abolished all the innovations introduced by the

French and Napoleon from law courts to vaccination. Priests were once more put into all the important offices in the Papal States, and the Jews were returned to their ghettos.

The Church gained much from its alliance with the conservatives. Regarded by the monarchs and nobles as the bulwark of the social order, it was restored in many countries to its position of privilege and supported by grants from the government. In France, the restored Bourbon regime once more put education largely under the control of the clergy—at least on the primary and secondary levels. Encouraged by the Comte d'Artois (after 1824 Charles X), the clergy had high hopes of recovering its lands, of abolishing the Napoleonic University, with its state monopoly of education; and of removing the obligation of civil marriage, as required by the Code Napoleon.

However, a movement began to woo the Catholic clergy away from their alliance with the conservatives. Its beginning is associated with a French priest of Breton origin, Felicité de Lamennais (d. 1854), a frail, commonplace-looking genius whose temperament inclined him to a prophetic, visionary role; his writings contain predictions that show an astonishingly accurate insight into the future shape of European and Catholic history. After a youthful enthrallment with the free thought of the Enlightenment, Lamennais was won over to the service of the Church and eventual ordination by his brother, a pious priest. Felicité de Lamennais' enormously successful writings helped to spur the Catholic revival. Conscious of the profound social and psychological transformation wrought by the French Revolution, he developed an extremely radical view of the new role of the Church in a postrevolutionary society and so became the founder of liberal Catholicism.

The experience of the Church during the Bourbon restoration as well as the example of other countries like Ireland convinced him that the Church must be completely separated from the state. It must sunder the golden chains that fettered it to the monarchy; only in this way could it obtain the freedom necessary for its inner renewal and so become more faithful to the Gospel and more relevant to the society of its day. Moreover, he felt that the reactionary

monarchy was doomed, and he wanted the Church to have no share in its ruin. Instead, he argued, the Church should seek its strength in a strong papacy-an idea that made him also one of the founders of nineteenth-century ultramontaniam.

Once you accept the liberal idea of separation of Church and state, Lamennais argued, then you must necessarily accept the rest of the liberal program: freedom of education because without it true religious freedom and freedom of thought could not be safeguarded; freedom of the press since a Christian must believe in the power of truth rather than trusting in censorship, which never succeeded anyway in stamping out error. Finally, Lamennais moved a half century ahead of his times-even beyond most liberals-by espousing complete democracy, demanding universal suffrage as the only way of achieving these freedoms. This was in accord with his doctrine of the universal consensus of mankind as the basis of religious certainty. Casting off its age-old reliance on the monarchies, it must now trust in the people.

By 1831 Lamennais had built up a following in France among the younger clergy and educated laymen. Some of the most talented Catholics of the day gathered around him, including Count Montalembert and Father Lacordaire. With their help he began a daily newspaper, *L'Avenir* (The Future), with the slogan "God and Freedom." Its aim was to sow the seeds of liberal Catholicism. "Let us not tremble before liberalism," he told his readers, "let us catholicize it."

But the bishops preferred to tremble. The archbishop of Paris fulminated against him for trying to subvert the order Jesus Christ established on earth. Separation of Church and state, he argued, would mean abject poverty for the Church. Lamennais agreed-but welcomed that prospect for he saw the combination of freedom and poverty as essential. Only by suffering physical wretchedness and poverty freely could the priest really feel solidarity with the whole of humanity and especially the poor and the weak those tortured like Christ on the cross.

Lamennais could not convert the bishops to his dream. They felt that his ideas of democracy and separation would mean the

ruination of the Church. They banned *L'Avenir* from the doors of the churches. Its circulation figures-never very high-began to slide, and its finances slipped into the red. Its readership was by its nature limited, since liberal Catholicism was an entirely new idea, and even secular liberals were not sympathetic to its democratic spirit. A sensational idea then occurred to Lamennais: Why not appeal to the Holy Father? "But what if we are condemned?" Montalembert exclaimed. "It is impossible, Charles," Lamennais answered. "We cannot be condemned." It was a fatal mistake. As the foremost ultramontane champion in France of Rome's authority, Lamennais may have felt that gratitude would move the Pope to some gesture of support. But he should have known better than to expect the Pope to jump on the liberal bandwagon at this juncture of affairs. Gregory XVI (d. 1846) was a former Camaldolese monk; as ruler of the Papal States he was utterly cold to the spirit of liberalism and revolution, and, in fact, he was engaged at the very time-with help of Metternich's troops-in trying to put down the revolutionary Carbonari, who were terrorizing the countryside and assassinating papal officials.

Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert-"the pilgrims of God and of liberty," in their words-reached Rome on December 30, 1831. To their dismay, one of the first sights that greeted them was the papal police conducting a group of poor wretches chained together crying piteously for alms. Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert drew up a long memorandum, which they submitted to the Pope through the good offices of Cardinal Pacca, the dean of the Sacred College. It surveyed the relations of Church and state during the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy and argued that after the revolution of July 1830, which overthrew the Bourbons again, complete separation was the only feasible solution. It also told the story of their journal and the opposition it encountered and concluded by urging the Pope to make a pronouncement. Then an agonizing wait began. As the weeks wore on, Lamennais became depressed by the spiritual and political atmosphere and began to sense the futility of his mission. In one letter he spoke bitterly of

Rome as a great tomb containing nothing but worms and bones. The Pope, he said, was pious but profoundly ignorant of the state of society, a hapless captive of corrupt rulers.

The Pope's reply did not come until August 30, 1832, after the disappointed pilgrims had already left Rome. His encyclical *Mirari Vos* was a scathing denunciation of the doctrines of liberal Catholicism, although a personal letter from Pacca to Lamennais tried to soften the blow. The encyclical rejected the separation of Church and state, denounced liberty of conscience as sheer madness, and referred to liberty of the press as abominable and detestable. The Pope demanded unqualified submission to the encyclical, and Lamennais spent more than a year in correspondence with the Holy See trying to salvage both his conscience and his loyalty to the Church. At first he submitted by resorting to a distinction between the Pope's authority in spiritual matters as opposed to temporal matters. But the Pope still demanded an unqualified submission. Then news came of how Gregory had denounced the Polish rebellion and lent his moral support to the schismatic Russian Czar, who brutally suppressed the uprising. It was too much for the abbe, He decided the issue was clear: The hierarchy had "divorced [itself] from Christ, the Savior of the human race, in order to fornicate with all his torturers."

In view of the Church's sorry experience with the liberals of the French Revolution, in view of the tumults in the Papal States aroused by liberals of the same ilk, and above all in view of the close association of liberalism with the skeptical philosophy of the Enlightenment, it does seem that Lamennais was naive in trying to push the Church to declare officially that liberalism was a system superior to the one under which it had lived and prospered for a millennium. It would obviously take more time and experience for the Church to make the distinction between the philosophy of liberalism and the political and social techniques it made use of. And it is well to note that while political pressure no doubt weighed on the Pope's decision, the standpoint of his encyclical was primarily doctrinal and theological. Rome saw in liberalism two main errors: a rejection of all supernatural revelation, and religious

indifferentism. The liberal doctrine of popular sovereignty and the demand for freedom of the press and freedom of worship were vitiated in the eyes of the Pope since they were derived from such obviously false assumptions.

When all this is said it still seems unfortunate that Gregory embraced the other extreme and virtually canonized the existing social order as having permanent and even divine validity-an attempt to bind the Church and Europe to forms of government and society that had seen their day. The open schism between liberalism and the Church that began with Pius VI's condemnation of the French Revolution was hardened by this action of the Pope. Nevertheless, while the cause of liberal Catholicism suffered a grave setback in the Lamennais affair, it won a victory at the same time in Belgium, where liberals and Catholics shared a common hatred of the Dutch rule that had been imposed on them by the Congress of Vienna. They ousted the Dutch King in the revolution of 1830 and liberals and Catholics together-drew up the very liberal Belgian constitution (1831), which was based on the very liberties condemned by the Pope in *Mirari Vos*. In the meantime, the secular liberals achieved remarkable success elsewhere as the forces of revolution made headway against the spirit of Metternich. Men like Bolivar and O'Higgins carried the revolution to triumph in South America; by the year of Bolivar's death in 1830, many of the Latin American countries had adopted liberal republican constitutions. Revolutions were put down in some of the Italian states and in Poland, but the Greeks liberated themselves from the Ottoman Empire. In 1830 the liberals in France installed a liberal monarch, Louis Philippe. In Great Britain the liberals won a big victory in the reform Act of 1832, which enabled them to share power with the conservatives. In central and eastern Europe, however, reactionary conservatism remained in control.

In spite of Lamennais' defection, the liberal Catholics did not abandon ship; Montalembert took over at the helm. Without abandoning their commitment to modern liberties, they adopted a pragmatic stance and sought to avoid confrontation with the papacy on the level of theory. Montalembert formed a Catholic political

party-the first in Europe 'dedicated to securing liberty for the Church in education. Lacordaire devoted his marvelous rhetorical talent to the pulpit of Notre Dame, where he exerted considerable influence over the intelligentsia. Frederic Ozanam, another devout liberal Catholic, founded the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in order to aid the poor.

The year 1848 was an important one for the liberals. Moved by the success of their fellows in western Europe, those in central and southern Europe showed increasing boldness and demanded constitutions guaranteeing individual liberties. After violent conflict they were able to drive the monarchs out of many capitals and forced Metternich himself to flee from Vienna. Though setbacks occurred when the Austrian armies reoccupied Vienna and put down revolutions in Bohemia, Italy, and Hungary and the Prussian King recaptured Berlin, the fact remained that the liberals had demonstrated their considerable strength even in areas thought safe for autocracy. The liberal Catholics were more than ever convinced that the Church had to find a more positive relationship to liberalism than that expressed in *Mirari Vos* or risk losing all influence over the culture of the day.

It is well to keep in mind the diversities of liberalism presented by its history. The first stage of liberalism-which found expression in the French Revolution-was predominantly a political liberalism concerned with establishing constitutional guarantees for the rights of the individual: freedom from arbitrary taxation and imprisonment, freedom of speech and association. Under the influence of romanticism political liberalism was extended to include opposition to the domination of one nation by another. Liberals demanded liberation for "oppressed" and "enslaved" people and joined forces with nationalists.

with the advance of industrialization, another form of liberalism came to the fore: economic liberalism. These liberals dreamed of a coming materialistic millennium which could be realized if only the businessman and industrialist was given complete freedom of operation. Their ideal was a free market unencumbered by any combinations, whether of employers or

workers. They were against all customs duties and tariffs-protective measures of any kind-and were particularly hostile to trade unions. So effective was their opposition to labor unions that it was not until 1871 that unions obtained legal recognition in England and not until 1906 that they _could securely conduct even peaceful strikes there.

. Other liberals, however, saw the danger in economic liberalism-perceiving how in a time of huge corporations and trusts, tyrannical power could be concentrated in the hands of a few and annihilate the freedom of the less fortunate. They pointed to the workingman, who was now merely grist for the economic mill, mere chattel to be sold on the market under the sway of the law of competition. And so economic liberalism begat its terrible adversaries socialism and even anarchism.

By the mid-nineteenth century, liberalism manifested a multiform character. As Carlton H. Hayes says, "There was a political, an economic, an intellectual liberalism. There was a. radical, an atheistic, a moderate, a conservative, a Christian liberalism. Wherefore such diverse groups as English Tories and French Radical Republicans, Italian followers of Mazzini of Cavour, German admirers of Bismarck and German disciples of Karl Marx were all somewhere in the liberal tradition.

In time, however, the economic liberals acquired a virtual monopoly over the term; they were the sectarian Liberals (with a capital letter), the ones mainly responsible for giving liberalism an ugly connotation in the minds of many: the Liberal industrialists, big businessmen, bankers, railroad builders, traders.

The liberal Catholics had little sympathy with economic liberalism; they favored adapting the Church only to what was best in liberalism. They felt that greater freedom for the individual would mean real progress for humanity. Moreover, they felt instinctively that the future was on the side of the liberals. It was inevitable, they argued, that some mistakes would be made in trying to realize a more just society, one more conformable to the dignity of the individual. It would take time and patience. They wanted the Church to welcome the new order with the same youthful energy with which it had

adapted to other great historic and cultural mutations _instead of foolishly binding herself to a decayed and dying system.

Their opponents, the integralist Catholics, on the other hand, wanted the Church to declare all-out war on the principles of the French Revolution, which they saw as the work of Satan. They saw nothing good in liberalism, which had opened up they thought, an unbridgeable chasm between the modern world and the Church. Faithful to the spirit of Gregory XVI, they wanted the Church to seek wherever Possible a close alliance with any regime that would closely unite Church and state. These Catholics were authoritarian and intransigent in temperament; their chief spokesmen were Louis Veuillot, editor of the *L'Univers*; a Spaniard, Donoso Cortes; and the Italian Jesuits who edited *La Civiltà Cattolica*. By 1850 the Church everywhere in Europe was divided along these lines, each group looking on the other with a certain amount of suspicion-the integralists detecting heresy in liberal Catholicism, while the liberal Catholics suspected the integralists of constantly reporting them to Rome.

The opposition between the two parties was peculiarly sharp in France where Veuillot, a journalist with a genius for sarcasm and invective, hammered away daily at the fallacies of liberalism in his *L'Univers*. He won over a large part of the clergy and succeeded in reinforcing their authoritarian and doctrinaire tendencies. At his side stood imposing authorities in the French Church. One of these was Cardinal Pie (1815-80), who though admittedly untypical, illustrates the absurd lengths to which an integralist could go in identifying the Church with crusading royalism: He surrounded himself with legitimist bigots, helped raise a regiment of papal volunteers to defend the lost cause of the Papal States and, on the side, endorsed the effort to recover Christ's Sacred Prepuce, "the only part of Christ's body left behind when He ascended into heaven." Another integralist was Dom Cueranger, the narrow-minded abbot of Solesmes and one of Pope Pius IX's favorites. To counter their influence Montalembert took over a monthly, *Le Corresondant*, with several collaborators. They were soon joined by one of the leaders of the French hierarchy, Monseigneur

Dupanloup, outstanding preacher and bishop of Orleans since 1849, the enfant terrible of the episcopate, who often barely managed to keep his fiery temperament under control. He too was most anxious to find a way out of the impasse between the Church and the revolutionary modern world.

Elsewhere in the Catholic world the same type of polarization occurred. But although the basic issue remained the same in each instance-how the Church should relate to the movement for greater freedom-the terms of the debate changed with each country. The German liberal Catholics, for example, never regarded separation of Church and state as an ideal; but their leaders, like Bishop Ketteler of Mainz, only thought that in certain circumstances it might be the lesser of evils. In general, as we shall see in the next chapter the German liberal Catholics were more concerned with the issue of freedom within the Church. Their leader, Professor Dollinger, called for greater freedom for theologians. His disciple, John Acton, took the same line in England, and in his liberal Catholic Rambler-which he took over from Newman in 1858-preached the doctrine of intellectual freedom. The Belgian liberal Catholics, after the encyclical *Mirari Vos* under their leader, Archbishop Sterckx, espoused a pragmatic attitude and defended the liberal orientation of the Belgian Church as the only feasible policy in their circumstances.

However, in the 1850 a group of liberal Catholics emerged there who took a more positive view of liberalism. even on the ideological level they proposed it as more consonant with the Gospel than the old order.

The election in 1846 of Pius IX (Pio Nono in Italian) first was good news for the liberal Catholics and a cause of alarm for Metternich, since the new Pope was reputed to be something of a liberal. At first Pius lived up to the reputation: He issued a general amnesty for political prisoners, made provision for sharing the government of the Papal States with laymen, and finally granted his subjects a constitution that set up a bicameral form of government whose lower house, the Council of Deputies, was elected by indirect suffrage. And although the constitution left the Pope an absolute veto, it still

represented a real division of power, since any civil administrative or political law, including the imposition of taxes, had to be voted by the councils. It also included a form of habeas corpus and abolished political press censorship.

The Pope's reforms were hailed with enthusiasm by liberals around the world. But in no way did they actually represent a conversion to liberal Catholicism; Pius had no intention of implementing liberal ideas on freedom of religion and, in fact, still refused to accord civil and political equality to Jews in the Papal States. To a great extent the Pope was only yielding to the political pressures of the moment. But at least it seemed a promising beginning.

The whole experiment soon broke down, however. The Pope's parliament declared war on Austria in an attempt to ally the Papal States with the risorgimento-the great Italian movement of liberation and unification. But Pius, although very sympathetic to the cause of Italian unity, could not see himself involved in a war against Catholic Austria, and he imposed his veto. It was an extremely unpopular step and caused fury to run wild in the streets of Rome. Demonstrations were staged, riots broke out, and the democratic extremists exploited the widespread discontent. An assassin stabbed and mortally wounded the Pope's Prime Minister on the steps of the Council Chamber and a revolution erupted. A mob of citizens and soldiers surrounded the papal palace, trained a field gun on it, and made the Pope a virtual prisoner. But by a clever ruse the Pope, garbed as an ordinary priest, managed to escape to Gaeta in the South, where he had to take lodgings at first in a second-class hotel. The leader of the Italian liberation movement, Giuseppe Garibaldi, entered Rome with his ragged followers and helped set up a democratic republic. A little later Giuseppe Mazzini arrived and inaugurated his new religion of humanity and progress, although he refrained from indulging in anything like Robespierre's fantasy of inventing a new liturgy.

The poorly organized democrats, however, were soon chased out by French bayonets, and the Pope rode back through the Lateran gate on April 12, 1850-escorted by French troops

and resolved to show no more leniency toward liberalism. The happenings at Rome had proven for him beyond the shadow of a doubt that liberalism meant only anarchy and persecution of the Church. He would continue to carry out reforms but would allow no more talk about constitutions if he could help it. Nor did his subsequent experience in any way disabuse him of this attitude.

Liberals, in the meantime, had taken over the northern Italian state of Piedmont, and under Camillo Cavour, the Prime Minister, carried through a number of laws offensive to the Church. They abolished most of the religious orders and stripped the Church of control over education. But worse was in store. Cavour conceived the audacious idea of uniting the whole of Italy under the Piedmont liberal monarchy. His first objective was to seize the Papal States, leaving only the city of Rome for the Pope. He was able to engineer a series of uprisings in the Pope's domain, and then under pretext of restoring order move his army in and occupy the land. The Pope made a valiant effort to resist the aggressors; his tiny army of Swiss Guards was enlarged by volunteers recruited from Catholic countries around the world. But they were no match in numbers or training for the Piedmontese and were cut to pieces at Castelfidardo in 1860. This left the Pope holding only the city of Rome and its environs. At this point one may well wonder why the Pope did not how to the inevitable and accept the settlement offered by favour. In exchange for his renunciation of the Papal States it would have guaranteed complete independence and liberty for the Pope; entire and exclusive jurisdiction of the Pope and bishops over the clergy; complete freedom of religious education; ownership of the palaces, galleries, and monuments traditionally belonging to the papacy; and a regular agreed income for the papal court, for the Sacred College, and for the episcopate and clergy as a whole. It would have given the Church complete freedom in the sphere of preaching, teaching, the press, and association. In other words, it was a settlement not too dissimilar to the one actually negotiated seventy years later in the Lateran Treaty.

Such a settlement would also have secured the same civil liberties for the subjects of the Papal States as were already enjoyed

in Piedmont and would have relieved the Pope of the terrible burden of his little kingdom-an increasingly glaring anachronism in a world of big powers. One could hardly argue any longer that the Papal States were necessary to secure the independence of the Pope's spiritual authority, since in order to retain them he was increasingly dependent on France and Austria.

For some time the matter hung in the balance. Reactionaries and those of liberal tendency in the Curia pulled the Pope one way, then the other. Cardinal Antonelli (d.1876), Secretary of State and chief of the reactionaries, was in many ways the evil genius of Pio Nono. Cardinal Antonelli's mentality is revealed in his constant assertion that the laws of the Church, being eternal, cannot be subject to political necessity and that before Pio could hand over even a jot of his rights as Vicar of Christ on earth it would be his duty to seek, as did some of his predecessors, some other Avignon in a neutral section of Europe.

Various reasons determined Pius' final policy. There was the resentment at Sardinia's past Machiavellian maneuvers and aggressions. There was also his strong feeling of personal obligation to maintain unimpaired the heritage of the Church, as all his predecessors had done since the time of Pepin. "If the Lord wants me to lose the Papal States," he would say, "then let him take them away. I cannot hand them over." There was also his realization that a takeover by Piedmont would mean the installation of a liberal secular regime over the whole of Italy, with the concomitant spread of heretical doctrines. An insight into his feelings in this regard are found in a conversation he held at the time with the British attaché, Odo Russell, about the possibility of an Italian confederation as the best answer to the problem. The Pope remarked that he could never accept British representation in such a confederation, since Britain would probably advocate freedom of the press, an institution he could not consider consistent with the laws of the Church, which was obligated to guide public opinion and inculcate morality on the minds and the behavior of the people. Never, the Pope insisted, could he allow the press to be free in the states of the Church, since morality forbade it.

So the Pope finally decided on a policy of intransigence. He decided to spare no effort to recapture his territories, and he declared war on the secular liberal concept of the state now embodied in the government of Piedmont. His final "No" to the liberals and the liberal Catholics was his Syllabus of Errors. But before recounting that episode, something must be said about another aspect of the liberal Catholic movement-their quest for greater intellectual freedom in the Church.