

**National University of Ireland  
Maynooth**

**Irish views on the arrest of the Archbishop of  
Cologne, 1837**

by

**Henrik Bollermann  
(ERASMUS)**

**In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of M.A.  
Department of Modern History,  
National University of Ireland  
Maynooth**

**Head of Department:  
Professor R.V. Comerford**

**Supervisors of Research:  
Dr Thomas O'Connor  
Dr Jaqueline Hill**

**July 1998**

**Contents:**

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>I. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. The course of events in Cologne</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. Irish views</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>III.1. The Freeman's Journal</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>III.2. The Dublin Review</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>IV. Conclusion</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>V. Bibliography</b>	<b>38</b>

## I. Introduction

On 20 November 1837, the archbishop of Cologne, Clemens August Droste-Vischering was formally arrested by officials of the Prussian King Frederick William III, and brought to the fortress of Minden. Obviously, this provoked reactions and comments throughout the world, especially as Prussia was seen by many as a model state in terms of implementation of freedom of conscience. However, in the Prussian provinces of Rhineland and Westphalia, tensions between the Protestant administration and the Catholic population and clergy had been growing for some years, eventually leading to the drastic measures adopted by the government. These tensions, and especially the situation after the arrest of the archbishop, were monitored by the Catholic press in Ireland, as the situations were somewhat comparable. In this work, I will therefore have a closer look on a part the Irish reception of the events. I will examine, how the events were covered in the chosen publications. For a Catholic population that had achieved formal emancipation, but was still discriminated against in many ways in matters of everyday life, e.g by the collection of tithes for the established Church of Ireland, what was emphasized in the coverage, and what was only briefly mentioned, if at all? What was the reason for a specific way of presenting the events, and what intentions and aims were hidden between the lines?

To be able to do so, I will at first give a fairly detailed overview of the Cologne Turmoils as such, as it is very important to establish the facts of this historical event. The affair is not very well researched from a historic point of view, because it stands in the shadow of the *Kulturkampf* that took place later and was more important for the development of society in Germany. Therefore, not too much literature on this specific subject exists, and it is all in German, which is quite surprising in a way, because after all the affair was a major event in Prussian politics of the early nineteenth century, and especially interesting for foreign countries such as Ireland. However, an account can be found in most (not all!) general historical works on Germany and in handbooks on (German) church history, which present a more or less general overview of the event and the problems that led to it. In the modern works, most notably *Herder's Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, the affair is presented as a preliminary 'testing of strength', preceding the *Kulturkampf*. Older literature on the subject tends to be surprisingly subjective and in favour of one side of the conflict, although a comparison of the different works can lead to a very detailed insight into the arguments, especially if one also examines some of the important primary sources, like Goerres' *Athanasius*, or the very important *Beitraege zur Kirchengeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland*, as well as the many collections of official Prussian documents, which are accessible. The works of Bachem and

Keinemann are very good for that purpose, as they contain very good and extensive bibliographies, and volume two of Keinemann is a collection of key primary sources, containing correspondence and official files. The standard work on the Cologne Turmoils, however, is Schroers' *Koelner Wirren*. Although published in 1927, it is still the most detailed and best description of the affair, examining the important points of conflict from the moment they first appeared, presenting the course of events before, during and after the affair and commenting on the effect the affair had on social and political life in Prussia.

The contemporary Irish publications that I am going to examine under the cited questions in the main part of this work are *The Freeman's Journal* and *The Dublin Review*. Both have a strongly Catholic liberal background, but are examples of different types of publication. The *Freeman's Journal* was a daily newspaper, and therefore covering the events as such on a day to day basis, with only a fairly general overview of the background. However, at certain stages of the affair, the *Freeman* presented and commented on the events in a specific way. Most of the coverage is very briefly and, as was normal for foreign news at a time when telegraph networks did not yet exist, second hand information, taken from foreign newspapers that were closer to the scene. This, and its position within Irish politics and society, had implications for the reports the *Freeman* published, as I will show.

The *Dublin Review*, on the other hand, was a quarterly periodical, concerned with reviews of recent books and other publications, seemingly an unpolitical and purely intellectual publication. Moreover, it was published in London, and its intended readership was primarily the English Catholic middle-class. Over the situation of Catholics in Prussia, the *Review* entered into the field of political discussion, which appears to have been very unusual for that kind of periodical at that time, as an editorial in volume three (April 1837) implies; giving a good example of how important the subject was considered to be by the editors. I will have a close look on the relevant articles to find out how the situation in Prussia was perceived and presented and try to find out what intention lay behind the publication of these articles.

As this work can only be a start to examine the relationship the Irish Catholics had to their brethren in Prussia, who were in a situation that was comparable in principle, my bibliography will contain more primary material than I actually used for this thesis. In citing the most important sources for a look at the relationship the Prussian administration had towards the Catholic population, I hope to encourage historians to find out more on this topic, as I consider it to be an important topic of European social history, on which very little research has been conducted, although the sources are very easily accessible, as most of the official archive material of Prussian

times has been compiled and edited. The bibliography will therefore contain the most important editions of official sources on the topic of relations between Catholics in the western provinces and the Prussian administration.

## **II. The course of events in Cologne**

At the Vienna Congress in 1815, Prussia, as one of the great contributors to the defeat of Napoleon, gained large territories in west Germany that had been under French rule. These territories were combined into the new Prussian provinces of Rhineland and Westphalia. The majority of inhabitants of these provinces were Catholics, whereas Prussia was ruled by a Protestant monarch and called itself a protestant state.<sup>1</sup> After 1815, more than one third of Prussia's population was in fact Catholic, thanks also to the new provinces in the east. As Prussia was an absolute state, this situation posed many difficulties to the administration. Therefore, the unofficial maxim of the Prussian government was that "Aufgabe eines Staates ist, die herrschenden Teile seiner Einwohner zu vermehren und den unterworfenen Teil zu vermindern: germanisieren gegen die Polen, protestantisieren gegen die Roemer [i.e. Catholics]"<sup>2</sup> These proceedings were very delicate, because Prussia was seen as, and officially adhered to the principle of, an 'enlightened absolutism', guaranteeing freedom of conscience and having a written set of laws, the *Landrecht*.

The status and organization of the Catholic church in the new provinces had been negotiated between the Prussian government and the Holy See and were published in the papal bull *De Salute Animarum* on 16 July 1821. The most obvious and immediate result of this was a new diocesan organization in the western provinces of Prussia, by which the archdiocese of Cologne with its sub-dioceses of Munster, Paderborn and Trier was created. The first bishops of these were to be appointed by the pope, after negotiating with the Prussian court, and in case of vacation of a seat, the bishops were to be elected by the cathedral's chapter according to canon law. The bull was implemented in Prussia by royal decree and became part of the country's laws.

Therefore, Protestantization of the provinces was planned, and had to proceed, very subtly. Officially, freedom of conscience was granted and the Catholic church had the same status as the recognized Protestants, i.e. Lutheran and Presbyterian. However, owing to the different hierarchical structures of the two, this was a disadvantage for the Catholic church. All publications, as well as

---

<sup>1</sup> See Bachem, p.159.

<sup>2</sup> Bachem, p.160. 'a state has to increase the ruling part of its population: Germanize against the Polish, Protestantize against the Catholics'.

official correspondence, especially with the Holy See, had to be approved of, and forwarded by, the royal administration, thus giving the government an easy and clandestine possibility of censoring by just holding back the documents.<sup>3</sup> This was particularly disadvantageous for the Catholics, as the censorship of letters and publications, including orders and instructions from the Vatican and the bishops' correspondence with the parish priests, was carried out by an entirely Protestant administration. I will come back to this in more detail later, as it had a major effect concerning the troubles in Cologne.

The fact that the Catholic church was under the control and jurisdiction of an entirely Protestant administration in an absolute state created some more problems. Because the church's landed property had been secularized, it depended entirely on payments granted by the state. The *Beitraege zur Kirchengeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland* gives a polemic, but nevertheless instructive, example of the problems that arose from this policy: "Ein protestantischer Rath bestimmt, wie viel Messwein und Wachs, wie viele Hostien etc. etc. in einer katholischen Kirche gebraucht werden!!!"<sup>4</sup>

If a bishop's seat is vacant, canon law requires the chapter of the cathedral to elect a new bishop within three months. Freedom to do so was officially granted by the government, with the restriction not to elect *personae minus gratae* to the king. In practice, however, it meant that the king 'proposed' one *persona regi grata* to be 'elected', thereby indirectly declaring every other possible candidate as *minus grata*. The 'election' could not be held before the king had announced his favourite, even if this took considerably longer than three months.<sup>5</sup>

To slowly Protestantize the Catholic majority in the new provinces, the Prussian government had another approach. Because the whole administrative system of the new provinces had to be reformed and restructured according to the Prussian system, thousands of new civil servants were needed. These new civil servants were not recruited out of the local population, but were brought in from the Prussian 'heartland', i.e. they were all Protestants. Moreover, most of them were young and single, attracted by the good possibilities a career in the west would offer them. When they settled in the Catholic areas, they naturally mixed with the local population and many of them married Catholic women. These mixed marriages, and especially the education of children from such couples, were to become one of the key aspects in the Cologne Turmoils.

---

<sup>3</sup> The same rules applied for the Protestants, but had not the same consequences, as the king was head of the church anyway.

<sup>4</sup> *Beitraege*, p.10. 'a Protestant official rules over the amount of wine, wax and hosts used in a Catholic church.'

<sup>5</sup> See Bachem, pp.164f.

Before the *Landrecht* was introduced, a mixed couple would reach a mutual agreement about the religious education of their offspring, which would be documented and signed before the marriage took place. It is important to note in this context that the Catholic church required the promise of Catholic education before a priest would be able to perform the ceremony. However, the introduction of the *Landrecht* -a lawbook for a Protestant state- forbade this practice and replaced it with the rule that in every mixed marriage boys had to be educated in the religion of the father, whereas girls had to be brought up according to the mother's creed. All treaties and agreements that ran counter to this rule were to be regarded as non-existent and illegal. The new practice was deliberately designed to strengthen the Protestant communities in Catholic dominated areas, because, due to the policy of bringing in young, single civil servants, the vast majority of mixed marriages had always been between a Protestant groom and a Catholic bride.<sup>6</sup>

When the diocese of Breslau became a Prussian province, the royal administration felt that this system worked "nicht ausreichend zu Gunsten des Protestantismus"<sup>7</sup> and on 21 November 1803 it was changed by royal decree. From then on, all legitimate children had to be raised in the religion of their father, regardless of their sex. Effectively, this meant in most cases of mixed marriages that the children would be Protestants. The priests were required to give their blessings to a marriage, even without the couple's promise to bring their children up as Catholics, which would have been illegal.

The Prussian government wanted to introduce the same system in the Rhineland and Westphalia, when they became Prussian provinces. However, it turned out that, because of the guaranteed equal status of the Catholic church to the Protestant in these territories, the procedure would not be as easy as in the eastern parts of the country. Moreover, in most parts of the western provinces, the Napoleonic *code civil*, rather than the *Landrecht*, was still observed and guaranteed. It allowed the husband to choose for himself in which religion his children should be raised, meaning that he could still legally promise to rear his children Catholic if he engaged with a Catholic woman. In practice, therefore, the offspring of almost all mixed marriages continued to be brought up, at least nominally, Catholic, because priests would not perform a marriage ceremony otherwise.

On 17 August 1825, however, a royal decree was issued that extended the 1803 order to the western provinces, although this measure ran counter to the takeover treaty of 1815. Most of the Catholic clergy were aware of this contradiction and therefore continued to deny their blessings to mixed couples without the promise to adhere to the Catholic upbringing of their children. Many

---

<sup>6</sup>See *Beitraege*, pp.57f, Bachem, p.174, and *Herder*, p.395.

liberals in the west also became conscious of the struggle of the Catholics, to whom the assured freedom of conscience was seemingly denied, and supported the church. This relationship is quite surprising, as the Catholic church and liberalism had traditionally been fierce opponents.<sup>8</sup> Because the government would neither repeal the decree nor wanted to see public tranquillity disturbed, it embarked on negotiations with the Holy See on the topic, conducted by the Prussian ambassador in Rome, Bunsen. The outcome of these negotiations was the papal brief *Litteris altero abhinc* of 25 March 1830.

Most importantly, the brief allowed priests passive assistance at mixed marriages according to governmental regulations. Weddings that had taken place without Catholic assistance had to be recognized retrospectively by the Catholic church and absolution of women, who had been married in a Protestant or civilian ceremony, had to be granted.<sup>9</sup> However, active assistance of priests could not be requested unless the canonic principles would be observed, which was practically impossible under Prussian law.<sup>10</sup>

Although these guidelines were as tolerant as the Catholic church could possibly allow without giving up its principles, they did not satisfy the Prussian government. The administration wanted to encourage mixed marriages to achieve its aim of effective Protestantization. Therefore, further negotiations with the Archbishop of Cologne, Ferdinand August Graf Spiegel, as head of the Catholics in the Rhineland and Westphalia, were held before the new policy was published. As a result, a convention was signed by both parties in 1834. This agreement was effectively a "Verdrehung der paepstlichen Verfuegungen."<sup>11</sup> In it, Archbishop Spiegel conceded that passive assistance should be limited to those cases in which the mixed marriage appeared to be 'thoughtless'. Wherever possible, priests should be actively involved in the ceremony and give their blessings. In practice this meant that the Catholic party just had to *sound* religious in a preceding conversation to get a full Catholic wedding ceremony. Even if this did not happen, 'morally mitigating circumstances', like settlement of a family feud or even a pregnancy, could secure a Catholic wedding.<sup>12</sup>

The bottom line of the convention was the notion that everything was permitted "was in dem Breve [of 1830] nicht ausdruecklich untersagt, oder was als zu beachten, bestimmt ist angegeben

---

<sup>7</sup> Bachem, p.174. 'not enough in favour of Protestantism'.

<sup>8</sup> See *Herder*, p.396 and Bachem p.176.

<sup>9</sup> Many priests had denied absolution to such women, because they were not legally married according to canon law.

<sup>10</sup> See Schroers, pp. 152f and Bachem, p.176.

<sup>11</sup> Schroers, p.153. 'turn the papal regulations upside down'

worden."<sup>13</sup> To be able to fulfill the royal decree of 1825, the pope was said to have issued 'a kind of dispensation'.<sup>14</sup> Apart from the fact that these notions were against all lay and clerical legal traditions, they were just not the truth. On the contrary, the pope had explicitly stated that he was not able to fulfill all Prussian demands.<sup>15</sup>

Neither the papal brief nor the 1834 convention were ever officially published in Prussia. Even the priests received official notice of the 1830 agreement only when it was accompanied by the 1834 convention and sent to them as official guidelines for their proceedings in cases of mixed marriages. The pope was not even informed of the very existence of the 1834 convention, because all correspondence between the Vatican and the dioceses was filtered and censored by the Prussian administration. Only when in November 1836 the bishop of Trier lay dying, he confessed his signing of the convention on the demand of Archbishop Spiegel as a sin. The confession reached the Holy See unofficially and thus could not be used for an official diplomatic protest against the Prussian practice. However, the pope did inform the Prussian envoy, Mr Bunsen, that he had received notice that a convention existed between the church and the government which jeopardized the papal brief. Mr Bunsen explicitly denied this!<sup>16</sup>

Archbishop Spiegel died in August 1835, and the government proposed Clemens August Droste-Vischering as his successor. This decision was reached as a result of closely assessing Droste's state of mind and opinions. The government concluded that Droste was an unpolitical character, mostly concerned with theological and dogmatic matters, who would not resist the government 'um des kirchlichen Friedens willen.'<sup>17</sup> In the negotiations between Droste and the government's representative, he was asked whether he would act according to the spirit of the papal brief of 1830 and the Prussian regulations, if appointed. His written [sic.] answer to this question stated that he did not want to touch the papal brief or the Prussian instructions, and he promised to apply them "nach dem Geist der Liebe, der Friedfertigkeit."<sup>18</sup> It seems that this specific promise turned the scales in favour of Droste as new Archbishop of Cologne.

However, it is not clear whether Droste actually knew about the 1834 convention. Schroers argues convincingly that Droste did not know the contents of it, in fact he was not able to know it at

---

<sup>12</sup> See Schroers pp.153+157.

<sup>13</sup> Schroers, p.152. 'not explicitly prohibited in the brief'

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> See Schroers, pp.152ff.

<sup>16</sup> See Ibid. and Bachem, p.176.

<sup>17</sup> Bachem, p.177. 'for the sake of ecclesiastical peace'. Contributing to this misjudgement was the fact that Droste had for several years been living an ascetical and secluded life in a Westphalian monastery.

<sup>18</sup> Quoted from Schroers, p.227. 'according to the spirit of love and peace'

all, because only active parish priests received notice of it and Droste was by then living too secluded a life to get proper notice of it. Anyhow, Droste felt that he had a vocation to become the new archbishop and thought it a sin to reject this offer. Thus, he conceded that he would work in the spirit of formal agreements on the ground of the papal brief, even if he did not know the contents properly. The government, on the other hand, and especially *Kultusminister* Karl Freiherr von Altenstein, whose responsibilities included matters of the church, were sure that Droste knew the contents of the convention and approved of it.<sup>19</sup>

On 29 May 1836, Clemens August Droste-Vischering was officially inaugurated as Archbishop of Cologne. Very soon, he came into conflict with the government over the treatment of the Hermesian school of thought at Bonn University. From 1819 until his death in 1831, Georg Hermes had been professor for dogmatics there, and during his time he found many disciples who adhered to his doctrines. Hermes was influenced by enlightened philosophers like Kant and Fichte, and tried to adjust Catholic dogmas to the rationalist movement, to 'fight Kant with his own weapons.'<sup>20</sup> He used the idealist demands to prove the divine truths on a purely rationalist basis. In his work, he was actively and morally supported by Archbishop Spiegel. However, his theories were strongly opposed by Catholic traditionalists, romantics and rationalists alike.<sup>21</sup> After his death, a nuncial inquiry was conducted, concluding with a papal ban on Hermes' works and theories.<sup>22</sup>

The faculty of theology at Bonn University was understood as being part of the Cologne seminary, and as such under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Cologne. The university itself, however, was funded and controlled by the Prussian *Kultusministerium* (also responsible for Catholic matters) under Mr Altenstein. Droste believed that every Catholic professor at the faculty, apart from Professor Klee, adhered to Hermes' doctrines. This exaggerated view was also held by the archbishop's mostly traditionalist councillors. So one of Droste's first major acts as Archbishop of Cologne, with a papal ban to support him, was to stop every lecture at Bonn's faculty for theology, with the exception of Professor Klee's, meaning that effectively the faculty was closed down. His aim was to achieve unlimited control over the faculty, including the right to nominate and dismiss lecturers, and to reincorporate it into a reformed Cologne seminary as a full tridentine seminary under archiepiscopal control.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> See Schroers, pp.224ff.

<sup>20</sup> Herder, p.293.

<sup>21</sup> The main points of criticism were his excessive moralism and the lack of understanding for the Christian tradition that showed in his works, see *ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> See Herder, pp.292ff., Schroers, pp.336ff. and Treitschke, pp.692f.

<sup>23</sup> See Herder, p.397 and Schroers pp.478ff.

Although the reason for Droste's acts was purely dogmatic and therefore purely clerical, the Prussian administration would not tolerate this kind of interference with the university. The Archbishop of Cologne, as theological supervisor, had the right to check and stop any theological lectures before the start of term by ways of controlling the lecture catalogue, but he was not legally able to close down almost the whole faculty in the middle of term and ban the lecturers rather than the lectures. Thus the government interfered by publicly criticizing Droste, and the minister for education himself embarked in negotiations with the archbishop. According to Schroers' detailed reconstruction, Droste had received unofficial instructions from the Holy See early in 1837, to challenge the Prussian government in order to establish full freedom of conscience and put an end to the discrimination against Catholics and the Catholic church. After the pope got notice of the secret convention of 1834 through the bishop of Trier's confession, it was decided in Rome that the Prussian government had to be stopped in its attempt to Protestantize the Catholic areas, especially in the self-confident western provinces. Therefore, Droste delayed the negotiations by conceding small and rather unimportant matters, but in principle keeping up all his demands. The government, unaware of Droste's instructions and overall aims, did the same, because Droste appeared to be a 'reasonable and diplomatic character'.<sup>24</sup>

This judgement was based on the fact that in the first months in office, Droste acted very much in favour of the Prussian regulations concerning the more important (and much more public) mixed marriages problem. However, after Droste had received the papal instructions, he started to change his policies. At first, he only supported individual priests, who would still not bless a mixed couple or participate in the wedding ceremony until the decisive promise of Catholic education was given. The government, and especially the *Oberpraesident* of the western provinces, Friedrich von Bodenschwingh, started to get concerned about the conduct of the archbishop, and tried to get him to sign an official document, stating that Catholic assistance should not depend on the 'formal promise of Catholic education'.<sup>25</sup> Droste refused, but issued another document, saying that the 1834 convention "hat den Zweck,...die Ausfuehrung des paepstlichen Breve zu erleichtern, aber nicht die, das paepstliche Breve unwirksam zu machen. Ich befolge demnach so viel ds moeglich beide Normen, wo aber die Instruktion [i.e. the convention] nicht in Einklang zu bringen ist mit dem Breve, da richte ich mich nach dem Breve."<sup>26</sup> This was an exact description of the course he pursued from then on, even publicly. It was obvious that the Prussian administration would not

---

<sup>24</sup> See Schroers, pp. 372ff.

<sup>25</sup> Schroers, p.474.

allow this breach of regulations to go unchallenged.<sup>27</sup> A serious conflict was about to break out, only the means were still uncertain.<sup>28</sup>

Above all, the notion that, although the king was recognized by the church as the head of state, the head of the church could *only* be the Pope, and concluding from that Droste's insistence that *all* matters of church depended on the policy of the Holy See, was intolerable for the Prussian government. However, the connected demand for a separation of church and state by the Catholic clergy appealed to the political Liberals in the Rhineland, Catholics and Protestants alike. The rare coalition between Liberals, normally despised by the Catholic church, and Catholic clergy, normally rather hostile towards Liberalism, secured considerable public attention and support for the archbishop and his cause.<sup>29</sup> This was a unique constellation in Germany, and it proved to be very fruitful, as traditionalist Catholics quite successfully adopted topics and especially methods of Liberal mobilization, e.g. the explicit demand for freedom of conscience, expressed in numerous pamphlets produced by Catholics at the time. The crisis also triggered the emergence of distinct Catholic newspapers and periodicals, one of which was the *Historisch-politische Blaetter fuer das katholische Deutschland*, which I will examine later. The Prussian government was very suspicious of the Liberal-Catholic alliance, especially because it feared Belgian Liberal influence would trigger a revolt against the state. Therefore, traditional Prussian counter-measures were taken, i.e. increasing of censorship concerning newspapers, pamphlets and other means of publication (reinforced by harsher customs-controls at the borders to prevent foreign publications from being smuggled into Prussia), and reinforcements for the military and police forces were commissioned to the western provinces.<sup>30</sup>

The following months saw an increasingly provocative archbishop, backed and supported by traditionalist clergymen and Liberals, on one side, and an increasingly suspicious and annoyed Prussian administration on the other side. Because Droste refused to compromise on his demands and practices, many Prussian officials called on their superiors for drastic action. On 15 November 1837, the royal cabinet ordered that the archbishop "habe sich fortan aller Amtshandlungen zu

---

<sup>26</sup> Droste to Bunsen, 18 September 1837, quoted from Schroers, p.474. 'was not made to negate the brief. I therefore try to act according to both, but where that is impossible, the brief will be my guideline.

<sup>27</sup> Because the convention was in fact a reversal of the papal brief, Droste's course meant that the convention was effectively no longer in use.

<sup>28</sup> See Schroers, pp.468ff.

<sup>29</sup> It is important to note, however, that the public support was in no way a mass movement, mostly due to the fact that Prussian policy concerning censorship did not allow too much publicity for the Catholic side. Therefore, the support was rather confined to intellectual circles, being able to lay hands on foreign newspapers, etc.

<sup>30</sup> See Pesch, pp.1ff, Hoemig, pp.7ff, Schroers, pp.559ff.

enthalten"<sup>31</sup>, and that he should proceed to Munster to await further instructions. There he might also get in contact with the pope or travel to Rome himself. If he refused, he should be forcibly brought to Minden fortress. Minister Altenstein commissioned *Oberpraesident* Bodelschwingh to carry out the operation, and he sent him some remarkable further instructions: First of all, it should be made absolutely clear that the archbishop would not be removed from his office (which could have only been done by the pope himself), but that it would be an 'administrative procedure'<sup>32</sup> to prevent him from doing his official duties, which would not be tolerated any more by the government. Moreover, under no circumstances should the impression of military force be given, neither to the archbishop and whoever might be with him, nor to the general public. Official, if possible Catholic, witnesses should be present to record the proceedings and everything should look like a "feierliche und imponierende Staatsaktion."<sup>33</sup>

These instructions were not carried out by Bodelschwingh, who feared that Droste would run into the cathedral to be dragged out by the army in full regalia, provoking a riot.<sup>34</sup> Therefore, Bodelschwingh ordered additional troops to Cologne and in absolute secrecy went to the archiepiscopal palace on the evening of 20 November. He and some officials entered the house at six o'clock and handed the royal order over to the archbishop. Predictably, he would not go to Munster and thus, after one hour's time to pack his things, he was brought to Minden, where he arrived on the morning of 22 November. The fortress commander had orders to treat Droste with humble respect and as a personal prisoner of the king. Contrary to widespread belief, Droste was never interned in the fortress itself, but was immediately allowed to move into a private accommodation within the walls that had been obtained for him. After a few days of house arrest, he was allowed to move freely within Minden near the Westphalian border under surveillance of policemen in plain clothes. He was also allowed to receive personal visitors under the conditions that ecclesiastical matters would not be talked about. However written correspondence was completely cut off, because Droste was only allowed to read letters in the presence of a high Prussian official, and had to hand out his own writings openly to this censor. Therefore, Droste refused to receive letters completely and sent all of them back to the senders unopened, including a letter from Cardinal Secretary of State Lambruschini.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> royal cabinet order 15 November 1837, quoted from Schroers, p.506. 'has to stop his official duties'.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid. 'Impressive and solemn official event'.

<sup>34</sup> This irrational fear of excessive reactions was a common feature of Prussian officials. Even Treitschke, historian to the Prussian court at the end of the century, gives this kind of picture, see pp.698f.

<sup>35</sup> See Schroers, pp.511f.

After a few months, most of the officials with whom Droste had contact advocated a move to let Droste go to his family home in the Munster area, as he himself wanted to. However, he refused to plead to the king personally. Instead he wrote a harsh letter to Berlin, accusing the administration of illegality in arresting him and denying the charges put against him officially. This obviously did not please Frederik William and the cabinet, but because Droste fell seriously ill later, and promised not to try to escape to Cologne, he was moved to his home in Darfeld to recover on 21 April 1839. When Frederik William IV became King of Prussia in 1840, Droste successfully pleaded to be allowed to move to Munster town, where he arrived on 29 July 1840 and stayed until he died on 19 October 1845.<sup>36</sup>

On the day after Droste's arrest, the government began a propaganda campaign to calm the Catholics and justify its actions. Posters were put up all over Cologne, and the Prussian newspapers published the official statement. An official indictment, addressed to the Metropolitan Chapter, was also published. The main argument in all these publications was that the archbishop had been conspiring with 'two revolutionary parties' "welche die Gemueter aufzuregen, die Gewissen zu verwirren suchen, um ihre zerstoerenden und weitgreifenden Plaene durchzusetzen."<sup>37</sup> Several other, real or imaginary, infringements of laws were stated, and much effort was made to clarify that, in spite of the appearance of the situation, the archbishop had not been formally arrested, but just moved away from the diocese to stop him from doing his official duties. The government also insisted that the question of mixed marriages was not the main reason for the measures, and that the Hermesian question was the real point of conflict. In stating this, the government was quite right, according to Schroers. Both were at least equally important in the eyes of the Catholic hierarchy, and Droste proceeded deliberately in concealing the Hermesian question from the public, because it was a purely theological matter that the general public, and especially the liberal supporters, could not easily relate to. The mixed marriage problem was different and potentially capable of securing a mass support for the church, because the average person in the streets of the Rhineland, as well as non-Catholic liberals, could relate to it.<sup>38</sup>

Although some attempts were made to stir up public opinion, the Prussian censoring machinery worked very effectively, so that life in the western provinces basically went on as if nothing had happened, and public tranquillity was well preserved. The administration believed that the worst part of the troubles was over and the whole affair would soon be forgotten. They were shocked

---

<sup>36</sup> See Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Official indictment, quoted from Schroers, p.520. 'which stir up the minds and confuse the consciences of the people to put their plans into practice'.

when the Pope issued an allocution to protest against the drastic measures taken by the government against the Archbishop of Cologne on 10 December 1837. In it, the question of mixed marriages was highlighted as 'the only reason'<sup>39</sup> for the actions. The other points of conflict were not mentioned at all, obviously for the above mentioned reasons. The Pope called for the immediate release of Droste and declared the 1834 convention on mixed marriages illegal according to canon law. Moreover, the allocution ended in a "oeffentlichen und feierlichen Verdammung"<sup>40</sup> of the Prussian church policy as such in front of the whole world. The impact of the statement was not only due to the language, but also to the fact that it was issued before the Holy See was officially informed by the Prussian envoy, and that it was entirely based on private information and newspaper articles.<sup>41</sup>

Based on the condemnation of the 1834 convention, the bishops of Paderborn and Munster announced that they would no longer respect it, and they officially informed the administration that they would return to the old policy. Despite the censorship, translations of the allocution began to circulate in the Rhineland and Westphalia, and priests read it from the pulpits to stir up public opinion. Particularly influential was the pamphlet *Athanasius* by Joseph Goerres, published in January 1838. Goerres, a famous theologian, wanted to clear the facts and awaken Catholic conscience to protest. However, Goerres did not want to provoke a revolt, he wanted peace for the state as well as for the church, and therefore demanded full freedom of conscience. The pamphlet was immensely popular, and although it was on a very high theological level, and was banned by the Prussian administration, Schroers estimates that at least 20,000 people must have read it. The language of the *Athanasius* was quite sharp and produced a courageous and daring spirit among the Catholic population. This spirit was further fueled by a wave of new newspapers and periodicals that were founded in the aftermath of the events in Cologne all over Catholic Germany. Goerres himself, together with Carl Ernst Jarcke, formed the *Historisch-politische Blaetter fuer das katholische Deutschland*, which would become one of the most important Catholic periodicals in Germany.<sup>42</sup>

The Prussian government was not able to counter this movement with its usual methods, because it had never experienced a peaceful and quite intellectual movement like that before. So it had to back down. No attempt was ever made to restore the 1834 convention in the western provinces, and soon it was also rejected in the eastern dioceses. When Frederik William IV succeeded his father on

---

<sup>38</sup> See Schroers, pp.519ff and pp.554ff.

<sup>39</sup> Quoted from Schroers, p.549.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid. 'public and solemn condemnation'.

<sup>41</sup> See Schroers, pp.549f.

<sup>42</sup> See Schroers, pp.553ff.

the Prussian throne in June 1840, the situation was further relieved. He set up a special branch for Catholic matters in the *Kultusministerium*, and in negotiations with the Holy See Prussia conceded most of the original demands of the Catholic church. 1840, therefore, is generally seen as the end of the Cologne Turmoils, although Droste-Vischering was never restored to his archiepiscopal seat in Cologne, the seat being left vacant until his death.<sup>43</sup>

### III. Irish views

#### III.1. *The Freeman's Journal*

The *Freeman's Journal* first appeared in Dublin in 1763 under the name *The Public Register or Freeman's Journal* as a daily morning newspaper. In the first years, with Charles Lucas as proprietor, its tone was liberal, yet anti-Catholic. Only around 1770, when the paper emerged as the organ for the patriotic Irish liberals, it started to favour "a measure of relief for the Catholics".<sup>44</sup> It upheld its liberal principles, even when, during the American revolution, almost all other papers did not dare to do so. However, in 1783, the paper was secretly subsidized by the Dublin Castle administration and Francis Higgins became publisher. Until his death in 1802, Higgins, known as 'the Sham Squire', was at the head of the *Freeman* and in pay of the government. The paper, therefore, completely ceased to be an independent and liberal publication and effectively turned into a government newspaper. This meant that circulation figures fell drastically, as the liberal-minded readership realized the papers change of tone.<sup>45</sup>

In 1802, the *Freeman* came into the hands of Philip W Harvey, who received a government pension and a subsidy from Dublin Castle for the newspaper. However, due to political changes in the Castle administration, Harvey lost the subsidies. Moreover, the Catholic question was still unsettled in Ireland and a widespread public debate waged on that topic, encouraged and fueled by major newspaper contributions, including the participation of the *Freeman*. By 1810, with Harvey in charge, the paper had again joined the liberal press over the Catholic question. It has to be said, though, that Harvey was not wholeheartedly on the side of the Catholics, "preferring to steer a middle course, reprobating extremists of both colours, orange and green."<sup>46</sup> Slowly, the circulation figures rose again and the *Freeman* established itself amongst the liberal circles of Dublin. In 1825,

---

<sup>43</sup> See *Herder*, pp.398f.

<sup>44</sup> *Brown*, p.20.

<sup>45</sup> See *Brown*, pp.20f and *Inglis*, pp.54ff.

with Henry Grattan jr succeeding Harvey, it stood sincerely behind the Catholic Association and advocated O'Connell's policy of Catholic emancipation in its leading articles. Since that time, it is fair to say that the *Freeman's Journal* was the leading newspaper of Catholic liberalism and O'Connellism.<sup>47</sup>

The first mention of the events in Cologne in the *Freeman's Journal* appeared on Saturday, 2 December 1837. The way in which it is presented is quite interesting. On page two, in the 'Foreign News' column, a short notice was given, taken from the *Augsburg Gazette* of 24 November, that "the differences which arose at Cologne, and at first only concerned the faculty at theology at Bonn, were daily becoming more and more complicated, and had extended to several other institutions."<sup>48</sup> It is striking that no mention was made either of the nature of the 'differences' nor of the person of the archbishop. The arrest, although it must have been known to the Bavarian paper, and was indeed already public in Britain as we will see, was not mentioned at all; although it would appear as the most important fact of the cited 'differences'. This is especially remarkable, as the *Augsburg Gazette* is one of the most prominent and radical Catholic newspapers in Germany at that time. So, the author of the notice in the *Freeman* must have known of the arrest, because he had the *Augsburg Gazette* as a source, in which the arrest was very prominent. Moreover, the notice only refers to the faculty of theology at Bonn, meaning the Hermesian problem, and does not mention the much more obvious, and easy to understand, mixed marriage situation, which would have also been featured in the source.<sup>49</sup>

However, in addition to the short notice on the Cologne affair, the *Freeman* featured much more on page three. To start with, a two-column letter of Daniel O'Connell to the editor of the *Morning Chronicle* is published, accompanied by a translation of the written statement Droste addressed to *Kultusminister* Altenstein on 31 October. O'Connell's letter is a comment on an article that appeared in the *Chronicle* on 27 November, reporting on the arrest of Droste. Thus, the news of Droste's arrest became public in Britain on that date at the latest. Nevertheless, no mention of it is made in the *Freeman* until a week later, and then only indirectly by ways of O'Connell's letter. The article O'Connell refers to is summarizing the mixed marriage problem very briefly, to state afterwards that the "Prussian government...urged the archbishop to resign. He refused, and a body of Prussian troops, having surrounded the palace, took the Prelate into custody, and carried him off to Magdeburgh[sic] for committing a breach of the public peace. It is a melancholy duty to be

---

<sup>46</sup> Inglis, p.121.

<sup>47</sup> See Brown, pp.21ff.

<sup>48</sup> This and all other quotes without reference are taken from the *Freeman's Journal* of the relevant date.

obliged to employ troops to enforce tolerance, but it is a sacred duty, when legally and constitutionally applied.” Interestingly, this article already contains some of the myths that would for a long time be attached to the arrest, such as the implication of the mixed marriage question as only reason for the arrest and the employment of troops surrounding the house.

In his comment on the article, O’Connell first makes it clear that he detests intolerance of any kind, and assumes the author of the article does the same. He then states that “I may be permitted to hate...the persecution of Protestants by a Catholic state more than the [opposite], simply because such a crime serves to tarnish the religion which I prefer and cherish. I am certain, also, that I do you no more than justice, when I attribute you detestation of Protestant persecution of Catholics.” With this, O’Connell skillfully implies that the author of the article in the *Chronicle*, being a tolerant mind, must despise the Prussian government even more than O’Connell himself does. It appears that the journalist did not do enough research on the subject, as he would then have come to a different conclusion altogether. O’Connell’s statement also discredits the *Morning Chronicle* as such, because their journalism appears to be unreliable. Having made this point, O’Connell then proceeds to put the writer of the article, and the readers of the *Freeman*, “in possession of the facts.”

The first thing for him to do is of course to state that “Droste de Vischring” is completely innocent, and that, on the contrary, the Prussian government is guilty of intolerance and of a “breach of the peace”. The archbishop’s “only crime was a conscientious refusal to administer the sacrament of matrimony in cases and under circumstances in which his sense of duty told him that he ought not to administer it. In that I am convinced he was perfectly right, and I have no doubt, that you and ever[y] other enlightened Protestant will agree with me when you are acquainted” with the facts. Especially the phrase “every other enlightened Protestant” is very interesting in this context, because Prussia was in fact seen by many British as a model state for an enlightened absolutist monarchy, as I already mentioned. However, in assuming that every enlightened Protestant must see the right of Droste refusing marriages under the said conditions, O’Connell challenges the entire picture the educated public held of Prussia. It is an indirect demand, especially to Irish Catholics, not to take Prussia as an example for ‘good government’. O’Connell then begins to expose the Prussian discrimination against Catholics and the reason why people still mistakenly see Prussia as a tolerant state.

Before O’Connell can reveal his facts on the actual arrest of Droste-Vischering, he has to give a general overview of what the situation of Catholics in the western provinces was like, as most of the

---

<sup>49</sup> See Schroers, pp.597ff for a description of the Catholic daily press coverage in Germany.

readers can only have had a faint idea. As a major source for his report he cites, and thereby recommends, the *Beitraege zur Kirchengeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland*. However, this book would indeed be difficult to obtain, because it “was published in Bavaria; but when the contents became known to the minions of the Prussian King, he interfered with the Bavarian government and procured the suppression and destruction of all the copies which remained unsold, and an edict forbidding the publication of another edition.” In stating this, O’Connell was exaggerating. The book was banned in Prussia, as soon as the contents were known to the administration, but the Prussian court did not interfere with the Bavarian court in this matter. It is simply not true that the unsold copies of the book were destroyed; and the “Red Book” as it came to be known, gained quite a reputation, as it was written by an insider in Catholic matters in Prussia.<sup>50</sup> The Bavarian government did stop a second edition, because it wanted to avoid diplomatic difficulties with Prussia, as both states were trying to reach terms for a more unified German political situation. O’Connell’s statement is only made to give his source more relevance and strengthen his argument that “the press is thoroughly and entirely enslaved” in Prussia. The paragraph is an example for the rhetoric of his whole article. Both his points are basically true, the *Beitraege* are a relevant source and censorship in Prussia was strict. However, O’Connell uses very strong language to influence the readers’ emotions, even more than a mere report of the situation would have done. It is important to note, therefore, that we are not dealing with a usual, rather neutral, newspaper report here, but with a polemic appeal to the Irish public on behalf of the Catholics in Prussia (and at home, as I will show).

The exaggerations continue, when O’Connell comes “to the more immediate subject,...the persecution of the Archbishop of Cologne.” At first, he states that “the subject matter and cause of that persecution were the marriages called ‘mixed marriages’.” Interestingly, the Hermesian problem is not mentioned at all in the letter, although the preceding article in the *Freeman* implies that this was in fact the first real cause. Thus, O’Connell is completely in line with the official church policy on the arrest, although the letter is written before any significant clerical statement on that matter had been published, as the pope’s allocution was issued on 10 December. The reason for O’Connell’s ignorance of the Hermesian question is the same as the church’s: the general public cannot relate to it, not in Germany and even less so in the UK, whereas the treatment of mixed marriages was a more or less obvious injustice and clear for everybody to see, no matter how educated in dogmatic matters.

---

<sup>50</sup> Judging from the detailed knowledge of the author, he must have been a high ranking cleric, possibly in

O'Connell continues that the children's education in mixed marriages "is a subject with which the law ought not to interfere. It should be let, as it is in these countries, to the contracts or agreements, or to the religious opinions or scruples, of the parties themselves." From the perspective of this typically liberal point of opinion he then sketches the Prussian *Landrecht* regulations, concluding it a "vexatious and meddling law; but [having] this much of justice in it, that it was equal, and bore with the same weight and severity on all parties." However, as I have already pointed out before, these regulations were altered in that way that all children had to be educated in the religion of the father.<sup>51</sup> O'Connell also mentions why this worked in favour of Protestantism. So far, O'Connell's statements are based on the facts and are taken from the *Beitraege*, although the language he chooses is quite polemic (which probably also stems from the polemic descriptions in his source). Some points are overemphasised, whereas others are implicitly ignored, as suitable for his appeal.

In his next statement, however, O'Connell stretches the facts too much. First of all, he states that the altered legislation was "followed and superseded by another law", which is not true, because the 1834 convention can hardly be seen on the same legislative level as the altered *Landrecht*, not only because it was only put into use in the archdiocese of Cologne and nowhere else. Anyway, the convention is not the law O'Connell refers to. He cites a law "Which in all 'mixed marriages'...*peremptorily prohibits* the bringing up any child as Catholic, although either or both parents should desire it."<sup>52</sup> This law did not exist in Prussia at that time! It would be true to say that, even if both parents desired to raise their children Catholic, which was something many parents did in fact desire, it would have been illegal if the father was not a Catholic. Those are the consequences of the 1803 legislation, introduced in the western provinces in 1825 and confirmed by the 1834 convention. So in practice, most children of mixed marriages could not be brought up Catholic. However, a law explicitly prohibiting Catholic upbringing in any mixed marriage was out of the question, even for the absolutist Prussian administration. It would have not only led to considerable unrest within Prussia, but moreover it would have completely alienated Prussia from important neighbours like Bavaria or Austria-Hungary. The whole reason why the Prussian practice in the Catholic territories was kept as secret as possible was exactly to prevent this kind of

---

Cologne's Metropolitan Chapter.

<sup>51</sup> Interestingly, O'Connell refers to the "Catholic provinces" of Prussia here, which implies in this context that the Rhineland and Westphalia were the only Catholic provinces. Those territories in the east, for which the law was initially altered, and where there was no significant protest or unrest, are implicitly ignored to present a clearer picture to his readership!

<sup>52</sup> Italics mine.

diplomatic difficulties and to keep up the image of a tolerant and enlightened state, suitable to play the dominant role within German politics.

In the next paragraph, O'Connell states that "the Catholic clergy very properly refused to celebrate mixed marriages under such conditions", leaving it to the Protestants, because Catholics "could not countenance so glaring a violation of the conscience of Catholics". Again, this is only half of the truth, especially when one considers that this very system had been in operation in the eastern provinces for years without significant Catholic protest. In the west many priests did refuse wedding ceremonies under these circumstances, but it is highly exaggerated to speak of "the Catholic clergy" as a whole, especially after the 1834 convention was signed, which O'Connell mentions further down in his letter.

First, he rhetorically asks the reader "whether the archbishop was not perfectly justified in such refusals" and illustrates this with a suggestion of changing the roles. He states that there would be no Protestant bishop willing to perform a mixed marriage, if the children "were bound by law" to become Catholics. Strikingly, this very illustration completely ignores the fact that there is a law demanding Catholic education of children from mixed couples, namely the regulations of canon law, the basis of the Catholic church. The question arises, whether O'Connell did not know this -he was not a clergyman, after all- or whether he deliberately does not mention this matter, because it would jeopardize the point he is making, and the notion of Catholic liberalism as such. What seems sufficiently clear, however, is the conclusion that mixed marriages in the UK did not face the same difficulties, either because the Catholic priests did not insist on the promise of Catholic education, or the Protestant clergy, and definitely the administration, were much more tolerant on this topic. A possible reason for this could be that the notion of freedom of conscience was far more popular in the UK than it was in Germany. In the aftermath of Catholic emancipation in Ireland, this notion was guaranteed and legally observed, whereas in Prussia the guarantee was just a theoretical one and was not implemented at all. Thus, O'Connell is justified in proclaiming "the very odious and execrable principle of persecution [of the archbishop] is the making one man the judge of another man's religious scruples; and without the aid of that principle you cannot censure the archbishop." O'Connell reveals this principle in such a way that every liberal mind must be appalled at the nature of the Prussian administration and government, thereby discrediting the author of the article in the *Morning Chronicle* and every like-minded person.

After having thus established the severity of the Prussian measure, O'Connell gives details on the 1834 convention, probably taken from the *Beitraege*, in an implicitly wrong context. He never mentions that the convention was actually negotiated with Archbishop Spiegel, and not with Droste;

and that Spiegel voluntarily signed it, even encouraging his suffragan bishops to also sign it. Moreover, the fact that Droste at first adhered to the convention is also ignored. In O’Connell’s words, “the archbishop and his clergy were called on with the severest menaces to subscribe to [the] convention”, of which he then cites the paragraphs saying that priests must not ask about the education of children prior to the marriage, and must not deny absolution to persons who do not educate their offspring in the Catholic belief. “Now, Sir, it is utterly impossible that any Catholic clergy man could conscientiously sign these articles”, although they were already, and presumably conscientiously, signed before Droste became archbishop. O’Connell must have known this, as he has the *Beitraege* as his source, which sets the convention in its correct context.<sup>53</sup> However, he cannot admit the real course of events without discrediting the Prussian Catholic clergy and the archbishop in particular. He would have to go much more into the details of the whole affair, which would probably confuse his appeal. Moreover, it is probable that he just had insufficient information to do so, as the *Beitraege* was published before Archbishop Spiegel died, and the German newspapers themselves were quite incorrect, thus resulting in a distorted picture of the events.

In the next paragraph, the picture gets even more distorted. O’Connell states that “all [Droste] did...was to refuse to comply. He refused meekly, but firmly”, which is a very rough, but legitimate summary of Droste’s acts. However, O’Connell continues that “he was immediately threatened with the vengeance of the government. He was told he should be destituted”, to which Droste allegedly replied that he would immediately do so and live “in poverty, and upon the charity of the faithful.” I cannot find any source proving this threat of the government, and no clue to such threat is given in Schroers, therefore this paragraph must be considered as fictional. O’Connell probably took it from one of the numerous Belgian or Bavarian publications of that time, which were fiercely opposed to the Protestant Prussian administration in the Catholic provinces. Moreover, the paragraph implies that Droste was well willing to resign as Archbishop of Cologne, which is in fact the exact opposite of the truth, and the very reason for his arrest. This implication is explicitly expressed in the first sentence of the next paragraph: “he was not allowed to retire into privacy”, something that is simply not true. After all, the main point of all the negotiations preceding Droste’s arrest was that he should either retire or comply with the Prussian regulations. He would not do either of those, and the arrest itself was not carried out to punish him for an offence (as O’Connell suggests), but to stop him from doing his official duties, as I have already shown in the previous chapter.

---

<sup>53</sup> See *Beitraege*, pp.107 & 131ff.

The description of the arrest itself repeats the popular myths that the archbishop's house "was surrounded by a troop of horse, and as fast as they could gallop he was hurried out of the city of Cologne, and carried off to Magdeburgh [sic!], there to await whatever fate his tyrannic master may impose." The fact that O'Connell also mentions Magdeburg instead of Minden as Droste's destination, without correcting the *Chronicle's* mistake, shows a lot about the reliability of his sources, as the two fortresses are not even close to each other. This might not have bothered an Irish readership, as these people probably could not tell the difference anyway, and it does not really matter to them where he was brought, but it is important to establish whether the information is taken from a Belgian or German newspaper, something that is impossible for me to find out. The reason for this importance is that the readers of those areas would have known that Minden is at the Westphalian border, thus near to the archbishop's home and relations (nearer even than Cologne), whereas Magdeburg is in the Prussian Protestant 'heartland' near Berlin, which would make the arrest appear even more cruel than it already was. Moreover, the following, highly polemic, statement adds to this implication of barbarous cruelty, by referring to ancient times, especially as the archbishop in reality knew where he was sent to and what would await him, which would definitely not be a dungeon cell.

O'Connell continues that "the Catholic church has always discouraged 'mixed marriages'. It wisely considers that sectarian animosities form a bad ingredient for domestic tranquility and happiness. It naturally desires that the children of a Catholic parent should be educated as Catholics...Between [the Catholic and Protestant churches] the law ought to be neutral. There is no justice -no fair play- except in that neutrality." With this, O'Connell comes back to his appeal for freedom of conscience and the demand for secular neutrality in spiritual matters. The interesting point in this is, however, that the neutrality of the law does not exist in spiritual terms. As I already mentioned, the Catholic church not only desires, but demands Catholic education of legal children. O'Connell does not mention this, and in his opinion it probably does not matter, because what he demands, getting even clearer when he continues, is state neutrality in this purely spiritual quarrel between two denominations. He does not take into consideration that Prussia is not a secular state with a Protestant monarch at the head of it, but, despite formal guarantees of freedom of conscience, an explicitly Protestant absolute monarchy, where the king's desires become law and a real parliament does not exist. Therefore it is not surprising at all that "the Prussian government becomes the partisan of one party", whatever promises of equality might have been made.

However, the situation in Prussia is not the most important thing for O'Connell. What really matters to him is made clear in the last paragraph of his letter: "I trust that public opinion in England

will be roused on this subject. I think there ought to be a meeting of the friends of religious liberty, of all denominations of Christians, to offer a token of sympathy with the sufferings of the venerable archbishop, and of execration of the...spirit of the Prussian despot towards his Catholic subjects, in violation of his solemn engagement and of the rights of conscience.” The really important matter for O’Connell is to rouse public opinion at home, and bring liberal minds together once again over matters of “religious liberty”. By discussing and condemning the situation in Prussia, the chances are good to discover what can and has to be done in the UK and especially in Ireland. Theoretically, Catholics there now enjoy the same rights as Protestants and are fully emancipated, whereas in practice Catholics in Ireland are still ruled, dominated and discriminated against by the Protestant Ascendancy. Not on the same level as in Prussia, but comparable in principle. “Protestant monopolies continued in spheres like the civil service, the police and legal appointments”,<sup>54</sup> exactly as in the Catholic provinces of Prussia. Also the question of tithes for the established church was still unsettled in Ireland.

So the escalation in Prussia offered a possibility for O’Connell to work on the same problem at home and make liberals, especially Protestants, aware that the difficulties are far from settled. That is the reason for the very polemic style of the letter, which was not only addressed to the editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, but primarily to the liberal readership of the *Freeman*. It was not O’Connell’s intention to give a true report of the events at Cologne, but to make an emotional appeal to look at the underlying system in Prussia and Ireland, which must have appeared quite familiar to his readership. The readers should then consider that some comparable events might also happen in Ireland, if the situation does not change. It therefore does not matter to O’Connell that his sources might be unreliable and he does not hesitate to distort the facts, if it serves to achieve his aim of emotionally appealing to his readership. The facts would be difficult to prove anyway, as he does not name any other sources than the *Beitraege*, which is only suitable for a general description of the 1835 situation in Prussia. In his opinion, the real course of events of the arrest can be neglected, as long as it is right in principle.

The editor of the *Freeman’s Journal* was probably aware of O’Connell’s considerations and implications. So, to give more evidence to the real events, the letter of O’Connell is followed by a translation of Droste’s letter to *Kultusminister* Altenstein. It is the manifesto Droste wrote on 31 October 1837, as an answer to Altenstein’s final demand to comply to the Prussian regulations; and Droste’s last official correspondence with the administration, leading to the warrant issued on 15

---

<sup>54</sup> Foster, p.307.

November.<sup>55</sup> It is a full and exact translation of the German original, which probably confused many readers, as it naturally paints a different picture in many details than O'Connell's contribution. First of all, the Hermesian problem is mentioned, of which the readership of the *Freeman* had no idea, as O'Connell does not mention it at all, and the short notice on page two on that same day does not explain anything. Then Droste goes on to the problem of mixed marriages, and obviously mentions the convention signed by his predecessor. He repeats his position "that I would do my very best to reconcile these instructions [i.e. the convention] with the brief [of Pius VIII, 1830], but that in all cases, where this should not be possible, the brief should be the sole rule of my conduct." After that, Droste goes in some detail into the negotiations with Altenstein prior to his election. All this must have confused the Irish readers a lot, especially if they were educated in clerical matters, as it implicitly contradicts O'Connell's statements in the details. However, the whole context of the statements is not explained any further, and so a rather uninformed reader would probably not have understood the whole text anyway. An important reason for its publication in the *Freeman* is the last paragraph, when Droste states: "I feel under the necessity of claiming liberty of conscience, and the free exercise of spiritual power." To my knowledge, this is the only occasion, where the archbishop explicitly uses the term "liberty of conscience" for his situation, and therefore it fits brilliantly in the context of O'Connell's letter, even if the details appear to be rather confusing.

The next mention of events in the Rhineland in the *Freeman's Journal* appears on 4 December, i.e. the following Monday. It consists of one sentence in the "Foreign News" column, stating that "the Rhenish provinces of Prussia are set in flame by the arrest of their archbishop." No further comment is given, and the readership is left with the implication that dreadful things, possibly a revolt, has taken place in Prussia, which is of course far from the truth. Two days later, on 6 December, we find another longer article, under its own headline, "Prussia". It contains a translation of an article from Prussia's *State Gazette*, the official paper of the Prussian government. Again, no original date is given, but the translation proves that it was published on 26 November.<sup>56</sup> It is the official justification and explanation of the Prussian government's actions, as I mentioned already in Chapter II. It is striking that, after O'Connell's polemic letter, the *Freeman* publishes this official statement. The introducing lines, preceding the translation, state that the article "agrees in general with the publications that have already appeared", which is true in so far as earlier articles

---

<sup>55</sup> The letter appears undated in the paper, but as Altenstein's letter is mentioned to be from 24 October, Droste's has to be from 31 October, see Schroers, p.494. The translation also confirms this assumption.

<sup>56</sup> See Schroers, p.510.

mentioned the arrest of the archbishop on his refusal to comply to government regulations, and his carrying away (not to Magdeburg, but to Minden). “It, however, gives further particulars respecting the conduct of the government, and the carrying away of the archbishop.” This is quite an understatement, as it gives in fact the first particulars, apart from O’Connell’s version.

Although the translation is quite correct, one important mistake occurs. Reporting on the choices the archbishop had been offered, it states that Droste might “choose a place of residence out of the diocese [of Cologne] in his native province of Westphalia, *for which* he might...apply in writing or in person to Rome.”<sup>57</sup> Now this implies that he could have asked the pope for ‘leave’ from his post, provided he gave the promise to the government “to refrain henceforward from all official acts.” The correct translation, however, must be ‘...Westphalia, *from where* he might apply...’, because it was offered to him to move to Munster and apply to the pope to settle the dispute, implying that his removal is a suspension rather than a dismissal.<sup>58</sup> It is striking that the *Freeman* publishes this euphemistic article without further comment, as many of the “particulars” seem rather unspectacular. The word ‘arrest’ cannot be found in this article, and Minden is merely “assigned [to Droste] for his temporary residence”. On one hand, this counters the image of the cruel and barbarous Prussian government as presented by O’Connell. On the other hand, however, it can serve the purpose of illustrating to the public the methods, which governments, not only the Prussian, but also implicitly the British, employ to present events and make them look unspectacular and perfectly normal, when in reality horrible things have happened. The Cologne affair is especially suitable for this purpose, as it involves no danger of libel at all for the *Freeman* to report on thoroughly foreign affairs, when at the same time the Irish situation is so comparable. The danger of misunderstanding is also minimized, as O’Connell’s credibility with the readers is undoubtedly much higher than that of the Prussian government. Supposedly, this is even true for people who politically do not agree with O’Connellism.

The next reports on the subject appear in the form of short notices on 12 December, when a Brussels paper announces that Prussian troops were expected in Aix -la-Chapelle to suppress riots (that in fact never took place), and on 13 December, to report that a delegation, “composed of the most respectable citizens of Cologne”, went to Berlin to see the king on the matter. No further notices appear until 26 December, partly due to the bad weather conditions and the resulting failure to receive the newest papers from the continent. The article appears under the heading of “The Archbishop of Cologne” and is no longer part of the “Foreign News” column. From that date

---

<sup>57</sup> Italics mine.

onwards, most of the articles on the subject actually appear under this heading, suggesting that the affair was now considered important enough by the editors to exclude it from the rather miscellaneous "Foreign News". The relatively long article is again a quotation from the *Augsburg Gazette*, introduced by the statement "that the exasperation excited against the Prussians by the affair of Cologne was now occasioning a species of revolution." This was obviously a vast exaggeration, especially as the events are said to have taken place on 12 December, when the news of the allocution could have hardly reached the Rhineland. The alleged streetfights definitely never happened and give a good example of the nature of the *Gazette*'s 'journalism'. However, at the end of the article, the readers are informed that "the Westphalian nobility continued to pay [Droste] every mark of respect", and that they "are becoming daily more hostile to the Prussian government." This is very true, in fact the Catholic nobility embarked in a kind of 'passive resistance' to Prussian social life, by isolating themselves completely from the 'high society' and declining invitations to all kinds of social events. Those who had a residence in the city retired to their country estates, and many resigned from official posts.<sup>59</sup>

It appears that the editors of the *Freeman* realized the polemic and rather unreliable nature of the *Augsburg Gazette*, which up to then was their main source of information on the affair. Therefore, in the issue of the next day, 27 December, we find an extract from the liberal, and rather neutral, *Frankfurt Journal*, apparently having a correspondent at Minden. The extract is a reliable and quite objective description of the archbishop's condition in Minden with the date of 12 December. The most interesting parts, however, are the last two sentences: "The Holy See must be acquainted with all that has passed before Dr Bruggeman and M Bumen[sic] can have arrived; because immediately after the arrival of the archbishop, a very worthy cure of the environs of Bonn, who is honoured with his entire confidence set out for Rome." As the article appeared in the German newspaper on the 19th, nine days after the allocution was issued, it suggests that the news of it, if not its contents, had reached Germany by that time, including the knowledge that the pope's sources were not the official Prussian envoys, otherwise the mentioning of the names of these envoys seems unnecessary. It is possible that the German paper mentioned further details of this, maybe even a notice of the allocution, but the *Freeman* did not publish any more hints. The fact that the source for this information is the *Frankfurt Journal* and not the *Augsburg Gazette* gives the whole notice even more significance, because of its reliability; and it probably increases the curiosity of its readers even more, to find out the reaction of the Holy See to the whole scandal.

---

<sup>58</sup> See Schroers, pp.510f.

This reaction, namely the allocution of 10 December, is featured in the *Freeman* on 29 December in two parts, a rather detailed introduction and the translation of the document. The introduction is surprisingly moderate in tone compared to the previous articles. No mention is made of apparent streetfights or a revolt, only that “the Catholic population is anything but satisfied with the treatment to which a dignitary of the church has been subjected...and so intense is the feeling of indignation in the western provinces, that we would not be at all surprised to hear that his Majesty of Prussia had been *compelled* to succumb to the omnipotence of opinion.” The implication of violent scenes is still present, but is not expressed explicitly, and the tone is much more solemn and distinguished, suitable for an introduction of a papal statement.

The second introductory paragraph refers to O’Connell’s letter that was published on 2 December, in which O’Connell “put the matter in dispute on proper grounds”, proving “to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced man that the archbishop had but one course to pursue. The view taken by Mr O’Connell is confirmed by his Holiness, who...gave his unqualified approbation to the course taken by the archbishop.” This is of course a thing to mention, the pope approving of O’Connell’s view; although the pope obviously did not know about the letter at all. The whole paragraph emphasizes on O’Connell’s judgement and wisdom, reassuring the public that he undoubtedly is the great leader the *Freeman* and most of the Irish Catholics see in him.

The following translation of the allocution submits the whole document to public discussion. Although it appears to be quite exact, there is again one mistake that gives the document a different connotation.. Referring to the “grave injury committed against the venerable Archbishop of Cologne”, it says that “it is no obscure event, learned by private accounts; it has been, on the contrary, officially communicated.” The correct translation would be the exact opposite; that the news was in fact not “officially commmunicated”, but entirely “learned by private accounts.” As I already mentioned in chapter II, the very fact that the allocution was issued *before* the Prussian envoys informed the pope contributed to its diplomatic harshness and public support and success.<sup>60</sup> In this translation, the whole sentence is unnecessary, because it would be the normal procedure to answer a diplomatic statement by another diplomatic statement, and it would not be worth mentioning. If it is not just a translation error, which seems unlikely to me, the only reason I see for it is the hope to give the allocution more weight in the eyes of potential Protestant readers. These might have not appreciated the power of the document just on the grounds that it was issued by the leader of the Catholic church, who would naturally favour the Catholic view of the events.

---

<sup>59</sup> See Schroers, pp.602f.

However, if the statement appears to be on the grounds of “officially communicated” facts, there is less possibility to consider it exaggerated, and it increases credibility among Protestants, thereby indirectly also increasing O’Connell’s credibility and distinction in these circles.

The next appropriate article, apart from a short notice on 1 January 1838, stating that the news caused “a great sensation” in Rome, appears on 3 January. It contains a summary of the Cardinal Secretary of State’s letter that accompanied the allocution when it was sent out “to each of the resident foreign ministers” at Rome. It further explains the pope’s reaction and his views, stating that “he had used every means compatible with the maxims and dogmas of the Catholic religion to deprive the Prussian government of the slightest pretext for attempting anything against the principles and authority of the Catholic church”. In short, every possible way of compromise was tried by the Holy See, but without success. Thus, the events at Cologne are seen “to be an attack, not only upon the ecclesiastical authority and pontifical supremacy, but also on the laws and unity of the Catholic church.” This includes the Catholic church in Ireland, strengthening O’Connell’s original call for “a meeting of the friends of religious liberty” from 2 December 1837. Interestingly, this core of the Cardinal’s letter is repeated in the *Freeman* on the next day, not in the “Archbishop of Cologne” column, but under the heading “Italy”, illustrating the importance that was attached to it, and the notion of defending Catholic unity and integrity in the Irish context.

Over the next few weeks, no significant changes or events occur in conjunction with the affair, either in Prussia nor in Rome. However, every few days, the *Freeman* quotes reports from either Belgian papers or the notorious *Augsburg* or *Wurzburg Gazettes*. These short notices contain mostly rumours or highly exaggerated accounts of unrest in the western provinces or on alleged negotiations in Rome. On 22 January, even the death of the Prussian king is reported, taken from “a Brussels paper”, although the *Freeman* notice at least mentions that this cannot be secured from any other source, as it was of course just a rumour. The lack of first-hand information and the apparent ignorance of the Prussian situation is manifest in the *Freeman* in these days. As nothing important happened, as far as the Cologne affair is concerned, the only source on that subject were the aforementioned papers. These, however, were completely unreliable in their information, and should rather be seen as political pamphlets. The *Freeman*, on the other hand, obviously had no means of establishing this insight into German politics and was therefore obliged to report these rumours as ‘quasi-facts’, even if they sometimes contradicted themselves.

---

<sup>60</sup> See Schroers, p.550.

On 15 January, e.g., the *Freeman* reported that Mr Bunsen “immediately had a conference” with the Holy See when he arrived in Rome. This information was taken from the *Augsburg Gazette*. On 14 February, however, it states that no such talks have ever taken place, as the pope refused an audience to Bunsen; taken from the rather more reliable *Munich Political Gazette*. The whole coverage gets an air of uncertainty, the only fact that can be established is the notion that “according to all appearances, the affair is likely to have very unpleasant consequences”, reported on 15 January.

Amidst all the wrong reports, some information is true; only it would have been extremely difficult for the contemporary Irish readership to find out, what actually was true. On 23 January, the *Freeman* quotes *Le Belge*, announcing that “the Bishops of Munster and Paderborn have both sent...to the Prussian government a written retraction of the signature which they gave to the famous convention relative to mixed marriages.” Although this information was perceived to be “important; for the Prussian government finds itself in the same position with respect to its prelates as it was towards the Archbishop of Cologne”, no further comment is given of this development in the following days. On 24 January, The *Freeman* received first-hand information by “a letter from Berlin [containing] a long *expose* of the Baron d’Altenstein...on the subject of the pope’s allocution.” This is the only first-hand information ever to appear in the *Freeman’s Journal* on the subject, and it gives a reliable summary of Altenstein’s letter to the pope, and thereby the Prussian proceedings. It indicates that the king is on the verge of compromising with the Holy See by stating that “his Majesty was determined to proceed in his course, with moderation certainly, but also with firmness.” Although it is said that there will be no changes in the Prussian policy, the mere mentioning of “moderation”, very unusual for Prussian politics at that time, indicates the willingness to negotiate. However, this was not understood by the *Freeman*, and in the next article, on 2 February, the rumors of the *Augsburg Gazette* are again the source for a report on the delegation of Westphalian nobles in Berlin.

On 3 March, after one month of several rather short notices of unrest in Prussia and Rome, all taken from the cited unreliable sources, the coverage starts to change slightly. On that day, the *Freeman* gives a summary of an article from the “*German Journal of Frankfort*”, announcing that the “Archbishop of Cologne would be shortly released from the fortress of Minden, and allowed to retire either to Austria, Bavaria or Italy.” Although this is still a rumor, and it took a long time until he really was released, it is a first indication that things in the affair might indeed be changing; and that an agreeable settlement is about to be reached. The next sentence indicates what this settlement might look like, as “it would appear that the Prussian government intends to

leave the archiepiscopal seat vacant during the lifetime of the prelate”, this being exactly what happened. And although the article describes, how the Bishop of Gnesen had “likewise taken a part in the question of mixed marriages”, thereby increasing the possibility of even more unrest, the whole coverage gets more optimistic and less gloomy over the next few weeks.

First of all, the former sources of the *Freeman*, i.e. especially the *Augsburg Gazette*, do not appear any longer, and indeed on 15 March, these publications are condemned as disdaining “neither religious nor political fanaticism to influence people’s mind. [Their] objects and views are wholly of a political nature, and having nothing whatever to do with religious sentiments”, they “must be designated as revolutionary and alarming”, as in fact they were. In announcing this, the *Freeman* indirectly acknowledges that its earlier reports were unreliable, something that strikes me as most unusual, although the names of the respective papers were not mentioned. It must have been quite a shock for the liberal *Freeman* staff to find out that many of the events they had reported on were actually not true and that their sources were completely unreliable.

The general situation in Prussia seemed to have eased anyway at that stage, and on 17 March, the *Freeman* reported on a cabinet order from Berlin that “was looked on as definitively settling the disputed[sic] question” by recognizing that priests did not have to perform mixed marriages without the promise of Catholic education. On the other hand, “ecclesiastical censures for not signing an agreement” concerning Catholic education were not to be enforced by the church. Two days later, on 19 March, it was reported that “the King of Prussia had received a letter from the pope, in which his Holiness proposed the conditions” for a settlement between the two parties. And another three days later, on 22 March, the *Freeman* announced that “the affair of Cologne is drawing towards its close...as it was deemed evident, that the Court of Rome would consent to no concession.” Although “all intercourse would cease between Prussia and the Papal government” and “King William was determined not to permit the Archbishop of Cologne to return to his diocese”, the conclusion of the article is quite positive, as “religious peace in the Rhenish provinces” seemed to be restored and the crucial mixed marriage question appeared to be answered in favour of the Catholics.

Although in reality the affair was far from being settled, on 24 March the last article on the subject appeared in the *Freeman’s Journal*, and it raises new problems indeed. It mentions that for the time being the Prussian government had suspended “those ulterior measures...necessary for it to adopt [in the affair]. One of these measures will be the promulgation of a penal law to enforce the execution of the cabinet order of the 17th of August 1825.” This sentence is not a closing statement at all, and especially the mentioning of penal laws against Catholics should have created

a considerable interest in Ireland with its long history of such legislation. However, no further article on the topic appeared, as more domestic problems are to be settled. At that time in 1838, most of the space in the *Freeman's Journal* was devoted to the Irish Poor Law question, with Daniel O'Connell heavily involved in the debate and the paper backing his arguments and reporting extensively on the debates in parliament. This phenomenon limited the coverage of all other foreign news as well, not only the Cologne Turmoils, which were becoming more and more unspectacular and difficult anyway, as they consisted by then almost exclusively of more or less secret negotiations and correspondence and raging public debates in the form of numerous pamphlets that circulated among the population (without arousing the people to fight on the streets).

### **III.2. *The Dublin Review***

The *Dublin Review* was a quarterly literature review magazine, founded in 1836 in London. It was actually never published in Dublin; as it was therefore a periodical based in England, it is seldom accounted an Irish publication. However, its contents were clearly dominated by Irish topics and its "task...was to uphold Catholicism, and particularly Irish Catholicism"<sup>61</sup> and promoting its cause in British liberal and especially Catholic circles. Moreover, most of its contributions came from Ireland, and Maynooth College was a major source for its articles. It was also strongly promoted by Daniel O'Connell, who was in fact proprietor of the magazine from 1836 to October 1837. The *Dublin Review* was quite popular among the Irish, and indeed English, *intelligentsia* in its call for "an Irish literature, a knowledge of Irish history, a spirit of pride in Ireland",<sup>62</sup> embedded in its reviews of books, periodicals and popular events that were perceived to be important or interesting for its intended readership.<sup>63</sup>

Already in December 1836, in no.3, the first article on the situation of Catholics in Prussia appears.<sup>64</sup> This article, entitled "Persecution of Catholics in Prussia", is a review of the *Beitraege* on the surface, but really a description of the state of affairs by summarizing the contents of the book. It is also the source for Daniel O'Connell's letter that appeared in the *Freeman* on 2 December 1837. The article starts with an introduction "to call the attention of the world to the system of slow and silent persecution which has been long wasting the strength, and exhausting

---

<sup>61</sup> Hayley, p.37.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> See *ibid*, pp.37f, and *Waterloo Directory*, p.182.

<sup>64</sup> See *Dublin Review*, vol.II, pp.169-186.

the patience of our continental brethren”<sup>65</sup> in Prussia. It is also explicitly stressed that Prussia had “been often pointed out, in our periodical works, as a fair model for imitation in the practical application of tolerant principles[.] And yet, God forbid that it should ever be adopted, even in poor Ireland! Better the titheproctor than the spy; more tolerable the open assaults of an adverse religion, than the smothering protection of a hostile government.”<sup>66</sup> These strong, appealing words precede the review, not without “remind[ing] our readers...that the Catholic worship is fully tolerated and recognized by law as either of the others, and that the professor of one faith stands before the eye of his country on a perfect equality with the professor of another.”<sup>67</sup> So the reader becomes aware, even before reading the actual reports and examples the article cites from the *Beitraege*, that Catholics in Prussia are even worse off than they themselves are.

The review, or rather summary, then starts by giving examples of discrimination of Catholics in different areas of life. In doing so, it follows the division of the source. First, the difficulties Prussian Catholics have in obtaining places of worship are highlighted in contrast to the ease with which small Protestant congregations are able to obtain permission to build or use a building for these purposes. Then the situation of education, especially higher education, is examined, focussing in particular on the Catholic faculties of theology at Prussian universities, something that will become a very important issue in conjunction with the Cologne affair, as I have already shown. Related to that are the complaints about Prussian censorship. Especially this point must have aroused the readership of the *Review*, as it was relatively unknown in the UK and completely contrary to anything these liberal-minded people believed in.

“From matters ecclesiastical, and educational, [the article] descend[s] to the state of social life, and...the equality of treatment observed in civil and military appointments.”<sup>68</sup> I have already mentioned that the formal guarantee of equality was not observed in practice, and the article then cites several examples taken from the *Beitraege*, relating to the judicial and administrative system, the army, especially the position of spiritual support for Catholic soldiers, and eventually to the mixed marriages. In that section, the cited examples are preceded by an overview of the legal situation and its history. It provides the basis for the referring section in O’Connell’s letter in the *Freeman* of 2 December 1837. However, O’Connell’s mention of a law that “peremptorily prohibits”<sup>69</sup> Catholic education does not come from this source, as the article, and the *Beitraege*,

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid, p.168.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid, p.169.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid, p.170.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid, p.176.

<sup>69</sup> *Freeman’s Journal*, 2 December 1837, p.3.

stay with the facts. It also has to be said that the mixed marriage problem does not play an important role in the article or the *Beitraege*, as it seemed to affect only a small number of people. Only in 1837, when the dispute between the Archbishop of Cologne and the Prussian government becomes more public, the did mixed marriages issue get attached with the significance they had in the following months of the Cologne Turmoils.

After having dealt with these matters of social life, the article summarizes and explains some of the laws that were “framed for the special *comfort* of the Catholics exclusively”<sup>70</sup>, like the prohibition of direct contact between Rome and the Catholic clergy, and the legislation concerning election and duties of the bishops. Following this extensive summary of injustices that the Catholic population of Prussia had to endure from their government, the article makes it clear that all this was not meant to be an attack on the King of Prussia. “It is not of him...that we have ever meant to speak, in any severe animadversions which may have escaped our pen. It is that indefinite, vague, unapprehensible thing, called the Government, that we have intended to reprehend.”<sup>71</sup> The importance of this statement is twofold: First, it makes clear that Catholics, in Prussia as well as in the UK, are loyal subjects of their respective monarchs, even if the monarch is not a Catholic himself, and that they do not intend any kind of revolution. Secondly, however, it is a liberal claim for just representation of the people within the government, i.e. by ways of electing a parliament, in Prussia even more important than in the UK, to make it more transparent and less “unapprehensible”.

The article concludes with a most polemic and emotional appeal to the Catholic population throughout the world to “feel towards each other as friends and brethren”,<sup>72</sup> as “there is no uniter of hearts like the chain of persecution.”<sup>73</sup> Of course, this is neither intended to be read by any Catholic outside the UK, nor is it a cry for ‘world revolution’. It is an appeal to the “Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland”<sup>74</sup> to continue their “marvellous work of...liberation through peaceful and lawful means.”<sup>75</sup> In short, Catholics in Great Britain, for which the publication is mostly intended, should unite with their brethren in Ireland and follow O’Connell’s path of Catholic liberalism, rather than give up their hopes or embark in political or sectarian violence, quite

---

<sup>70</sup> *Dublin Review*, Vol.II, p.183.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid*, p.185.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid*, p.186.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid*.

common in rural Ireland at that time. The enduring spirit of Catholics in Prussia, who are far worse off, offers a good example to consider.

This article must have aroused a considerable reaction among the readership of the *Dublin Review*, which was expected to be, and until then perceived itself, as a journal for literature reviews. The editors, therefore, considered it necessary to explain their views and reasons for publishing the article in more detail in a “Supplementary Note on the Article in No.III upon the ‘Persecution of Catholics in Prussia’” in the next issue.<sup>76</sup> In short, it is a justification of the article in general, as “it is not usual for quarterly publications to enter into controversies”,<sup>77</sup> and especially the cited circumstances and examples, as “the accuracy of our statements has been called into question.”<sup>78</sup> However, it also appears that many “respectable papers”<sup>79</sup> took the article as their source on the topic, therefore their statements had a certain reliability, although the conclusions and reports appeared to be surprising. In this note, a first mention is made of the new Archbishop of Cologne, “Baron Droste de Dischering”<sup>80</sup>, who had “just prohibited the students of the Catholic faculty of theology at Bonn from attending the lectures of any other professor than those of M Klee“;<sup>81</sup> thereby giving the first, and only, notice of the Hermesian problem. However, apart from stating that Droste “could not have made a better choice”,<sup>82</sup> no further comment on this is made.

In no.7 of the *Review*, dated January 1838, one finds an article on “The Allocution of his Holiness Pope Gregory XVI, adressed to the Consistory at Rome, 10th Dec. 1837”.<sup>83</sup> However, the allocution itself is not the real topic and is only published in its translation at the very end of the article, because the editors presumed that “our readers are doubtless acquainted with this important document”,<sup>84</sup> as it “has appeared in the English papers”.<sup>85</sup> There is not much to say on the allocution, anyway, as it explains itself. Therefore, the article is not a comment on the allocution, but an explanation of its context, because “a knowledge of the facts which preceded and brought on this event is indispensable, to form a correct and safe judgement on the conduct of

---

<sup>76</sup> *Dublin Review*, vol.II, No.4 (April 1837), pp.613-620.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, p.613.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p.619.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>83</sup> *Dublin Review*, vol.IV, no.7, pp.232-245.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, p.244.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*

the prelate, and on the tyranny of the Prussian government.”<sup>86</sup> In order to do so correctly, the *Review* claims to have obtained “an accurate statement of the circumstances from persons whose information is obtained near the scene of action, and on whose statements the fullest reliance may be placed.”<sup>87</sup> This sentence is quite significant, because it acknowledges the fact that much of the information on that topic is in fact unreliable, as many different versions and myths circulated in different papers.

The article then is surprisingly well researched and detailed indeed. It starts with Droste’s inauguration and gives an overview over the “two important affairs [that] required his most anxious care, namely, the doctrines of the late professor Hermes...and marriages between Catholics and Protestants.”<sup>88</sup> Here now, for the first time, the Hermesian problem is explained in more detail, i.e. its main doctrinal features and the history of the movement up to Droste’s steps is described. This is especially remarkable, as it is not mentioned at all in the papal allocution. However, the editors of the *Review* must have realized the importance of the problem, even though it is omitted in most reports on the subject, presumably because of its highly intellectual contents. The readership of the *Review*, however, was probably educated enough to understand the implications of Hermes’ doctrines. I could also imagine that the readers were rather anxious to know more about an obvious point of conflict between Prussian government and the church, because the *Freeman’s Journal* and probably most other newspapers had more than once hinted at it, but never went into details. So here they find a satisfying overview of the second important reason for the arrest of the Archbishop of Cologne.

However, most of the article deals with the procedures relating to the mixed marriage problem. The readers must at this stage already have had a general knowledge of the problem, as it was featured in the papers. The article, therefore, recapitulates the general situation, but goes very much into detail on the Prussian regulations and the course of events. The 1834 convention is not only mentioned, but explained and commented, and Droste’s conduct is described in detail by using quotations from his correspondence as well as from the correspondence of the officials Droste dealt with.

In general, the 12-paged overview is very good and, apart from some editorial comments and the introducing and concluding lines, quite objective. It presents all the important facts to the readers, to let them make up their own minds. It is definitely the best contemporary description of

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid, p.232.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid, p.233.

the Cologne Turmoils that I have found, as even German publications like the *Historisch-politische Blaetter fuer das katholische Deutschland* did not give an overview like that, mostly because those publications made an effort to arouse the public on either side and employed crude methods of propaganda. I have already shown that, to a certain extent, even papers like the *Freeman* were deceived by this kind of subjectivity. The source for this article in the *Review* must have indeed been well acquainted with the facts, and judging from the presented primary material, must have had an inside view of the events. In printing this article, the *Dublin Review* made a truly worthy contribution to establish the reasons for and the course of the arrest of Archbishop Droste in the minds of its readers.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In the first part of my work, I have tried to present the Cologne Turmoils in as much detail as necessary and as briefly as possible. Because the events are in the historical shadow of the later *Kulturkampf* in Prussia and the German Reich, research on the subject is rare, even in Germany. As I have already pointed out, the only comprehensive study is Schroers' book, published in 1927, although the affair is mentioned, more or less briefly, in most works on cultural and ecclesiastical history of that period. However, many of these tend to be badly researched and repeating one or more of the popular stories that exist around it. Therefore, I kept my overview close to Schroers' standard work, not without trying to find other reliable references, where possible.

One of the reasons for the ongoing perpetuation of some of these falsified account becomes obvious in the main part of my thesis, i.e. the study of the newspaper coverage. Most of the newspapers, being one of the more important sources for historians, tended to be strongly subjective and on one side of the conflict, as well as early historic works. Owing to this strong tendentious dealing with the subject, objective historical research is extremely difficult. This is especially true for a study on 'outside' newspapers like the *Freeman's Journal*, which were in no direct way involved in the struggle. However, these papers also tended to favour one of the sides, and were dependent on sources that were deeply involved. Therefore, it was not necessarily the truth that was reported. Whenever the *Freeman's Journal* mentioned its source for a specific article, it was easily possible to judge its contents. Unfortunately, this did not always happen, so a detailed knowledge of the real course of events is necessary to be able to analyse the contents of these contributions in the papers.

I have made it clear that the *Freeman* did not report on the events just for the sake of the news. Right from the beginning of the coverage on 2 December 1837, its focus was the significance of

the news for the situation in Ireland, brilliantly illustrated by the publication of O'Connell's letter instead of a normal newspaper report. That is the reason why most of the pieces deal exclusively with the mixed marriage problem, while the Hermesian question is only mentioned as an aside and without further explanation, if at all. The same is true for the lack of reports on the behaviour and reaction of the clergy in Prussia. It was important that the public could relate to, and understand, the issues that were reported on, especially if they had the potential to trigger a process of reflection on the situation of Catholics in Ireland, encouraged by O'Connell's appeal to the liberals, Catholics and Protestants, to meet and discuss the implications of the arrest. Even given the problem that the *Freeman* was until March 1838 not able to establish the reliability of its sources, the reports published are likely to have awoken a consciousness for the problems that might arise, if the emancipation of Catholics in everyday social life is not pushed forward.

Prussia was a perfect example for this. Firstly, there is an extreme situation on both sides, i.e. the Catholic church and the government, which would not be likely in the UK. However, extreme positions, allowing for clearly marked lines of conflict, are very good for illustration purposes, as the problems are easy to see and to understand, even for rather uneducated readers. Secondly, the fact that the whole affair was happening outside the British Empire, and had no relations to it on the surface, meant that the *Freeman* was able to report and comment on it in very open language, without danger of any libel or public outrage. However, people that were somehow aware of the situation in Ireland, and then read the *Freeman's* coverage on the Prussian situation, would be able to understand the principal similarities of the two. The many reports of unrest resulting from the affair, even though they were not true, which was of course unknown to the Irish public, were ideal to awaken the inherent fear of the readership in Ireland, and indeed in the UK, that a revolution might take place. According to the paper's reports, something of that kind was going on in Prussia, and it had to be avoided in Ireland. Therefore, the exaggerated coverage, whether consciously or not, triggered the awareness of the established society in Ireland to employ their peaceful and parliamentary powers to improve the situation, thereby avoiding a revolt.

The intention of the *Dublin Review* was slightly different, as was the intended readership. First of all, the readership was mostly based in England rather than in Ireland, and therefore not completely acquainted with the situation. However, it can be assumed that a fairly detailed awareness of it existed in the readers' minds, as they were mostly Catholics themselves and therefore interested in the fate of their brethren in Ireland. Moreover, the *Review* was intended for the more educated liberals, which is reflected in its style. The first article on the situation in Prussia was already published almost one year before the arrest of the archbishop, and the

occasion for it, the *Beitraege*, had by then already been in circulation for a year. Thus, this article has no direct connection to the immediate events of the Cologne Turmoils; it offers pure background knowledge on the situation of brethren in a seemingly comparable situation. The article on the papal allocution is similar, although it refers to a specific event. The contents of the article are again mostly background information necessary to fully understand the papal document. One could say, it is an update of the first article, including new knowledge that was unavailable in 1836.

As a quarterly periodical, the realm of the *Dublin Review* was obviously the presentation and explanation of exactly these background materials, rather than reporting on the course of events. However, it was intended to be an unpolitical magazine, reviewing literature, and not a forum for political debate. The fact that with the publication of the article on the *Beitraege* the *Review* entered the political stage after only two issues, must have been quite surprising for some of its readers, as the supplementary note in issue four illustrates. However, this note also shows that the step was done consciously by the editors, with Daniel O'Connell still at the head at that time. Its intention was to make the British Catholic *intelligentsia* aware of the existing problems in Ireland, by way of comparing them to the Prussian situation, and to show that terrible things might happen if they were not solved. In its intention, *Freeman's Journal* and *Dublin Review* are quite comparable, only their approach is different, due to the different forms of publication.

The *Dublin Review*, with a much more specific and educated intended readership, had more possibilities to elaborate certain arguments and was able to give more details in its description. The *Freeman*, as a daily newspaper containing of four pages, could only report the events as such with only little explanation. Moreover, less educated readers had to be able to understand the contents, whereas the higher standard of education allowed the readers of the *Review* to get to know and understand even things like the Hermesian doctrine and its implications. So the appeal to reflect on the situation of Catholics in the diaspora, and to sympathise with them, was much subtler, but the aim was the same as the *Freeman's*: Catholics, and liberal Protestants, should unite their powers and try to improve the situation of the Catholics in the UK, and especially in Ireland, by legal and peaceful means to prevent an escalation comparable to that in Prussia.

#### **IV. Bibliography**

##### **primary sources**

- *Beitraege zur Kirchengeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland*, Augsburg 1835.
- Bergstraesser, Ludwig, ed., *Der politische Katholizismus: Dokumente seiner Entwicklung*, Vol. I 1815-1870, Munich 1921.
- (Bunsen, Norbert ?), *Darlegung des Verfahrens der preussischen Regierung gegen den Erzbischof von Koeln. Vom 25. November 1837*, Berlin 1838.
- *Historisch-politische Blaetter fuer das katholische Deutschland*, Tuebingen 1838+1839.
- Goerres, Joseph, *Athanasius*, Munich 1838.
- *The Dublin Review*, London 1836+1838.
- *The Freeman's Journal*, Dublin 1837+1838.

##### **further primary material**

- Goerres, Joseph, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. by Wilhelm Schellenberg, Cologne 1926-39.
- Heinen, Ernst, ed., *Staatliche Macht und Katholizismus in Deutschland*, Vol I, Paderborn 1969.
- Hermes, Georg, *Philosophische Einleitung in die christkatholische Theologie*, (?) 1819.
- -"- , *Positive Einleitung in die christkatholische Theologie*, (?) 1829.

- Keinemann, Friedrich, *Das Koelner Eregnis, sein Widerhall in der Rheinprovinz und in Westfalen*, Vol. 2, Munster 1966.
- *Koeniglich-Preussisches Amtsblatt*, Berlin -1871.
- Landschaftsverband Westfalen-Lippe, ed., *Die Nachlaesse der Gebrueder Droste zu Vischering*, Munster 1964.
- *Preussische Statistik (Amtliches Quellenwerk)*, hrsg. In zwanglosen Heften vom Koeniglich Preussischen Landesamte, Berlin 1861.
- Rauscher, Anton, ed., *Der soziale und politische Katholizismus: Entwicklungslinien in Deutschland 1803-1963*, Munich 1982
- Reichert, Franz Rudolf, ed., *Von der katholischen Aufklaerung bis zu den Koelner Wirren: ein Verzeichnis von Flug- und Streitschriften aus der Bibliothek des Trierer Priesterseminars*, Trier 1978.
- *Sammlung der fuer die koenigl.-Preuss. Rheinprovinz seit dem Jahre 1813 hinsichtlich der Rechts- und Gerichtsverfassung ergangenen Gesetze, Verordnungen, Ministerial-Rescripte, etc.*, Berlin n.d.
- Schulte, Johann Friedrich von, *Handbuch des katholischen Eherechts: nach dem gemeinen katholischen Kirchenrechte und den oesterreichischen, preussischen, franzoesischen Particularrechte, mit Ruecksichtnahme auf noch andere Civilgesetzgebungen*, Giessen 1855.
- -"- , *System des allgemeinen katholischen Kirchenrechts, mit steter genauer Beruecksichtigung der Besonderheiten in Oesterreich, Preussen, Bayern, der oberrheinischen Kirchenprovinz, Sachsen, Hannover und Oldenburg*, Giessen 1856

### secondary literature

- Aubert, Roger, Johannes Beckmann, Patrick J Corish, Rudolf Lill, eds., *Die Kirche in der Gegenwart, vol.1* (=Hubert Jedin, ed., *Herders Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, vol.4/I*), Freiburg 1971.
- Bach, Trudel, *Johann Otto Ellendorf: ein westfaelischer Publizist zur Zeit der Koelner Wirren*, (Diss.) Munster 1934.
- Bachem, Karl, *Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der Deutschen Zentrumspartei, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der katholischen Bewegung, sowie zur allgemeinen neueren und neuesten Geschichte Deutschlands, Vol I*, Cologne 1927.
- Bar, Karl Ludwig von, *Staat und katholische Kirche in Preussen*, Aalen 1971.
- Bihlmeyer, Karl, Hermann Tuechle, *Church History*, vol.3, London 1966.
- Birke, Adolf M, Kurt Kluxen, eds., *Kirche, Staat und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert: Ein deutsch-englischer Vergleich*, Munich 1984.
- Brown, Stephen J M, *The press in Ireland: a survey and a guide*, New York 1971.
- Brueck, Heinrich, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert*, Mainz 1887.
- Foerst, Walter, *Das Rheinland in preussischer Zeit: 10 Beitrage zur Geschichte der Rheinprovinz*, Cologne 1965.
- Foster, R F, *Modern Ireland 1600-1972*, London 1988.

- Fulbrook, Mary, *German history since 1800*, Oxford 1989.
- Franz-Willing, Georg, *Kulturkampf: Staat und katholische Kirche in Mitteleuropa von der Saekularisation bis zum Abschluss des preussischen Kulturkampfes*, Munich 1954.
- Grogan, Geraldine F, *The Noblest Agitator, Daniel O'Connell and the German Catholic movement 1830-1850*, Dublin 1991.
- Haas, Raimund, ed., *Ecclesia monasteriensis: Beitrage zur Kirchengeschichte und religioesen Volkskunde Westfalens*, Munster 1992.
- Haensel-Hohenhausen, Markus, *Clemens August Freiherr von Droste-Vischering, Erzbischof zu Koeln 1773-1845: die moderne Kirchenfreiheit im Konflikt mit dem Nationalstaat*, Frankfurt/M. 1991.
- *Handbuch der Erzdiozese Coeln*, Cologne 1905.
- Hansen, Joseph, *Preussen und Rheinland von 1815 bis 1915: hundert Jahre politischen Lebens am Rhein*, Cologne 1990.
- Hashagen, Justus, *Das Rheinland und die preussische Herrschaft*, Essen 1924.
- Hayley, Barbara, Enda McKay, eds., *Three hundred years of Irish periodicals*, Mullingar 1987.
- Heinen, Ernst, *Staatliche Macht und Katholizismus in Deutschland*, Vol II, Paderborn 1969.
- Hergenroether, Joseph Kardinal, *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte, vol.3*, Freiburg 1909.

- Hoemig, Herbert, *Rheinische Katholiken und Liberale in den Auseinandersetzungen um die preussische Verfassung unter besonderer Beruecksichtigung der Koelner Presse: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Parteien im 19. Jahrhundert*, Cologne 1971.
- Huerten, Heinz, *Kurze Geschichte des deutschen Katholizismus 1800-1960*, Mainz 1986.
- Inglis, Brian, *The freedom of the press in Ireland, 1784-1841*, London 1954.
- Jones, Larry E, Konrad H Jarausch, *In search of a Liberal Germany: studies to the history of German Liberalism from 1789 to the present*, Leamington Spa 1990.
- Keinemann, Friedrich, *Das Koelner Ereignis, sein Wiederhall in der Rheinprovinz und in Westfalen*, 2 Vols, Munster 1966.
- Kloecker, Michael, *Theodor Brueggemann (1796-1866): eine Studie zur preussischen Geschichte unter besonderer Beruecksichtigung der Kultuspolitik und des politischen Katholizismus*, (Diss.) Ratingen 1975.
- - ” - , “Der soziale Katholizismus im vormaerzlichen Rheinpreussen”, in Lothar Koch, Josef G Stanzel, *Christliches Engagement in Gesellschaft und Politik*, Frankfurt/M 1979.
- Lavin, Thomas P, “Hermes: a guide to the role of the priest”, in *Chicago Studies* 21(1982), pp. 125-149.

- Leflon, Jean, *La crise revolutionnaire 1789-1846* (=Fiche, Augustin, Victor Martin, eds., *Histoire de l'eglise depuis des origines jusqu'a nos jours, vol.20*), 1949.
- Lill, Rudolf, *Die Beilegung der Koelner Wirren 1840-1842, vorwiegend nach den Akten des Vatikanischen Geheimarchivs* (= *Studien zur Koelner Kirchengeschichte, vol IV*), Duesseldorf 1962.
- Lipgens, Walter, *Ferdinand August Graf Spiegel und das Verhaeltnis von Kirche und Staat 1789-1835: Die Wende vom Staatskirchentum zur Kirchenfreiheit*, Munster 1965.
- Lortz, Joseph, *Geschichte der Kirche in ideengeschichtlicher Betrachtung, vol.2*, Munster 1964.
- Madden, Richard Robert, *The history of Irish periodical literature*, London 1867.
- Mann, Golo, *The History of Germany since 1789*, London 1972.
- North, John S, *The Waterloo directory of Irish newspapers and periodicals*, Waterloo,Ont. 1986.
- Oram, Hugh, *The newspaper book: a history of newspapers in Ireland, 1649-1983*, Dublin 1983.
- O'Tuathaigh, Gearoid, *Ireland before the famine, 1798-1848*, Dublin, 1972.
- Paukert, Heinz, *Preussische Verwaltung und katholische Hierarchie in der Rheinprovinz zur Zeit der Restauration*, Freiburg/Brsg. 1983.
- Pesch, Rudolf, *Die kirchlich-politische Presse der Katholiken in der Rheinprovinz vor 1848*, Mainz 1966.

- Rohrbacher, Abbe, *Histoire universelle de l'eglise catholique*, vol.24, Paris 1864.
- Schroers, Heinrich, *Die Koelner Wirren (1837): Studien zu ihrer Geschichte*, Berlin 1927.
- Schuetz, Ruediger, *Preussen und die Rheinlande: Studien zur preussischen Integrationspolitik im Vormaerz*, Wiesbaden 1979.
- Schwedt, Hermann H, *Das roemische Urteil ueber Georg Hermes, 1775-1831: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Inquisition im 19. Jahrhundert*, 1984.
- Sheehan, James J, *German history 1770-1866*, Oxford 1989.
- Sperber, Jonathan, *Popular Catholicism in nineteenth-century Germany*, Princeton 1984.
- Treitschke, Heinrich von, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert*, vol.4, Leipzig 1879-94 (new edition Koenigstein/Ts., 1981).
- Trippen, Norbert, ed., *Das Koelner Priesterseminar im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Cologne 1988.
- Vaughan, W E, ed. *A new history of Ireland*, vol.5, Oxford 1989.

#### **Periodicals on the subject**

- *Annalen des historischen Vereins fuer den Niederrhein*, Cologne 1855-
- Historisches Archiv des Erzbistums Koeln, *Studien zur Koelner Kirchengeschichte*, Duesseldorf 1952