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ABSTRACT

The expansion of the newspaper and periodical press in Victorian Britain was one sign of the rapid metamorphosis of the modern English city. The emergence of new forms of print media responded to growth in urban populations, shifting class definitions, and rapidly expanding technology and industrialization. Simultaneously, however, these new publications worked to articulate concepts of self and community during a period when domestic politics, immigration, international relations and colonial enterprises were testing and re-working the boundaries of the nation. This thesis focuses on the satirical illustrated journal *Punch*, first published in 1841, and explores the ways in which the periodical served as a site where anxieties over religious and “racial” difference in Britain were addressed and negotiated. A particular set of international events taking place at mid-century, the wars of Italian Unification (the Risorgimento), provide the vehicle for examining such social anxieties. As this study will show, the events of the Risorgimento were re-cast in *Punch* in domestic terms; specifically, the journal configured the foreign Italian wars of liberation in relation to contemporary Protestant concerns that Irish Catholics within the British polity posed a threat to cohesive notions of nationhood.

Within this context, an analysis of the social and political caricatures in *Punch* during the early 1860’s provides a basis for exploring how the journal’s visual rhetoric permitted opportunities for commentary not feasible in other periodical or newspaper forms. As I will argue, both text and satirical imagery within the comic journal, worked to forge a cohesive community of readers
through representation. This strategy, however, was ultimately indicative of the fractures within the delicate construction of British identity and modern nation space.
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Introduction

_Punch._ A smack in the face, the hard jab of a pun, the tradition of satirical slapstick in Punch and Judy puppet shows, and an alcoholic beverage which could allow the revelation of truths. _Punch_ is all of these at once, and more, as it is also the name of a satirical political journal – _Punch_ - published weekly in London from about 1841 until well into the twentieth-century. Mark Lemon, one of the founding editors of the periodical commented, “It was called _Punch_ because it was short and sweet. And Punch is an English Institution. Everyone loves Punch, and will be drawn aside to listen to it. All ideas connected to Punch are happy ones.”\(^1\) Indeed, the popularity of the journal’s name and its significance to nineteenth-century British publics is attested to by the numerous comic papers that circulated in the preceding decade with titles like _Punchinello, Punch in London, and Punch in Cambridge._ While _Punch_ played with some of the comic traditions of these earlier forms, the long version of its title – _Punch or the London Charivari_ – registered the journal’s concern with the French publication, edited by Charles Philipon: _Le Charivari._\(^2\) The publishing format of _Punch’s_ political cartoons mirrored that of Philipon’s biting satirical journal, as _Punch_ attempted, by association, to conjure up the flagrant abuse of politicians and monarchs for which the powerful _Le Charivari_ was notorious.\(^3\)

While a number of studies have addressed the history or politics affiliated with _Punch_ in the nineteenth-century,\(^4\) this thesis takes as its subject the complex ways in which satirical imagery featured in the journal worked in conjunction with the written word to order the conflicting and contradictory experiences of the
modern city, and nation, for a mid-nineteenth-century British readership. Specifically, I am concerned with the ways in which a discourse on the nineteenth-century British self was articulated through *Punch*’s visual and textual representations, especially in relation to notions of a national, religious and racial “other”. The coverage British newspapers and journals gave to the international events of Italian Unification and the struggle over the control of lands in Italy governed by the Papacy in the late 1850’s and early 1860’s, provides a vehicle for this discussion. As I will argue, these foreign events were re-imaged in *Punch* in terms of national and local concerns. Specifically, the wars of Italian Unification provided a touchstone for negotiating anxieties about class and ethnicity located around Irish Catholics, as they were constructed within the larger Protestant British polity. Within this context, an analysis of the social and political caricatures in *Punch* at mid-century provides a basis for exploring how particular visual vocabularies might have operated in conjunction with the text, to permit opportunities for commentary not feasible in other periodical or newspaper forms. Indeed, by charting the discourses interwoven within the visual and textual codes of *Punch*, heterogeneous viewpoints emerge, thus exposing the cracks and fissures, indicative of tensions and slippages of meaning within the construction of a unified nation space and concepts of British-ness.

French cultural theorist Roger Chartier has posed the question, “How can a text that is the same for everyone who reads it become an instrument of discord and battle between its readers, creating divergences between them, with each reader having an opinion depending on his own tastes?” This question is crucial
to my study in that it challenges the notion that a seamless translation of meaning occurs between the original intention of the text and subsequent interpretations by the readers/viewers. As Chartier points out, the physical form of the text, the ability and familiarity of the reader with implicit codes within the text and images, and various reading practices – for example, public or private reading – undermine a monolithic or fixed understanding of the text. Literary historian Janice Radway has also argued that reading is a productive act, not one of passive consumption. Readers make their own meanings based on a number of varying factors, including their participation in an “interpretive community” – in Chartier’s words, a community formed from groups of individuals who “share similar reading styles and strategies of interpretation.”

Reading is a productive activity in which the reader actively makes sense of the verbal inscriptions on the page... Textual meaning is the product of a complex transaction between an inert textual structure, composed of verbal signifiers and an actively productive reader, who constructs these signifiers as meaningful signs on the basis of previously learned interpretive procedures and cultural codes and strategies she believes the author intended to use; nothing in the text constrains her to do so, nor if she does is she necessarily successful.

Meaning then is ultimately created in this space produced between the reader and the text. It follows necessarily that the manifold cultural and social experiences between readers would provoke different responses.

*Punch’s* text elicited a variety of reading practices and levels of understanding. For instance, for a reader in London, social issues discussed or raised in *Punch* may have seemed more pressing than for a reader nestled in his or her country house outside the urban centre. In addition, *Punch* gave visual representation to issues of national significance, while the accompanying text
either complimented the illustration by speaking directly to the most obvious aspect of the joke, or gave additional information which put a new twist on the initial pun, sometimes tying in seemingly disparate material. Complete understanding of the text and image was achieved as one became familiar with Punch’s format; this was knowledge gained over time:

Many of these little jokes were puns and the pun remained the commonest kind of Punch humor for many years. If some of them were so labored as to make their reader’s response unimaginable, it ought to be remembered that when, as often happens, on term in the comparison was topical, it is impossible for us to judge the impact. There is a further difficulty that sometimes the joke is that they were deliberately bad puns and fathered by Punch on one of his butts, Colonel Sibthorpe. The butt who turned up week after week was often unfairly handled, but did give continuity at the small expenditure of space. By the third or fourth reference, even if only a single line to fill a column the reader felt a cozy intimacy between the paper and himself. He had become one of the club.¹⁰

Historian Jon Klancher has argued that the practice of reading and the language it activates can signal identification with particular communities. Klancher uses Bourdieu’s analysis of class formation to explain how social distinctions are formed on the basis of the outward possession and consumption of cultural or economic capital, which translates as “taste” and is internalized as a legitimate difference in social hierarchies.¹¹ Klancher situates the reader as part of a classed community, identified by a series of social and cultural markers which are invested with particular meanings, depending on the segment of society (economic and cultural) with which an individual identifies. He uses two nineteenth-century periodicals, the Edinburgh Review and Blackwood’s Magazine, as examples of publications using highly coded language in which part
of the reader's enjoyment comes from the chance to exercise the "powers of the mind" in deciphering the text. This pleasure at being asked to draw on many sources of knowledge in order to make meaning from the text creates, in the process of reading, a recognition of the self as part of a larger community. Extending Klancher's analysis to include the mid-Victorian era, I will argue that *Punch*'s jokes hinged on a reader's ability to interpret what has been referred to as "light" verse, which if it was to be understood, "required leisure, scholarship, patience, and a precise frivolity."

While the earlier Punch reader was unobservant of form, the late Victorian reader increasingly looked first at the shape [of the text]... Punch writers shared the same educational background of their readers and... the basis of that education was an exact verbal drill in Latin and Greek. Everybody was used to closely looking at words and listening closely to rhythms. Light verse was a game in which the whole point depended on keeping the rules.¹²

Victorian readers were thus engaged through the employment of rhetorical devices which asked them to draw upon their literary education in order to make full sense of the text. This "coded" text, however, made up only part of the journal's formula, as *Punch*'s visual format also elicited other forms of knowledge from its readers.

In order to assess more fully these visual vocabularies, *Punch* needs to be situated in relation to contemporary publications that circulated in the second half of the nineteenth century. *Punch*'s visual format most closely resembles those of the illustrated weekly papers, indeed, it is *The Illustrated London News* and papers like it, that *Punch* appears to have satirized in both its form and content. *Punch*'s text is structured so as to imitate news columns of such journals, and like
publications like *The Illustrated London News*, its content is almost all ultimately political. Widely circulated weekly illustrated newspapers, such as the *Illustrated London News*, used steel engraved images to suggest an immediacy to their news coverage, presenting information on foreign affairs, parliamentary proceedings, and the latest in the world of fashion, science, and literature. This form of the mass press was accessible to audiences from a variety of interpretive communities, whose access to cultural codes varied as much as their social status. The visual vocabularies used in *Punch* relied upon a potential reader's familiarity with many of these print forms; *Punch* was able to make a joke out of these publications because it assumed that a reader would identify the common vocabularies manipulated both in *Punch* and in non-satirical journals, and could then mock or make fun of these non-satirical forms. In *Punch*, "news" items are interspersed with small images and poems that were typically found in periodicals addressed to a more general reader, aiming to amuse or improve this reader through knowledge acquisition (Figure 1). *Punch*'s deliberately crude and quick caricatures sketched out with the waxy and variable tracing of a lithographic crayon, mocked the careful and studied drawings featured in the *Illustrated London News*, produced by that publication's "Special Artist" (Figure 2), thus challenging the kind of authenticity that "serious" weeklies wanted to claim. In addition, I would argue that *Punch*'s images, through their sketchy appearance, also referenced the sensationalist "trash" drawings of the popular penny press.¹³

As well, the journal's illustrative technique could also call up another form of the popular—the British Punch and Judy puppet shows that were performed
street-side and enacted biting political and social critiques. In such performances, the mischievous ‘Punch’ character usually breaks the law, has a brush with authority (a policeman, for example), and ends up making a fool (often violently) of that representative of social and moral order. The magazine, *Punch*, evokes this tradition of Punch and Judy, which carried with it both significations of English-ness, free speech, and a critique of authority. In the location of the gentlemanly arena of the journal, the play upon Punch and Judy was inverted, in effect, giving *Punch* expansive license to vulgarity or irreverent social and political commentary. This strategy is significant; *Punch* used the institution of Punch and Judy in order to comment on potentially dangerous or polemical subject matter while simultaneously disseminating its views on national and local events. *Punch* could thus address a sophisticated literary audience and avoid being considered vulgar precisely because it so blatantly mimicked that which was crude.

A reading of *Punch* also needs to take into account the complex and politicized nature of *Punch*’s humor that presumed – indeed possibly necessitated - a reader highly versed in Parliamentary proceedings, foreign affairs, cultural activities, and trends. In short, one who had access to daily newspapers or other “objective” periodicals. In fact, *Punch*’s humor was predicated on knowledge of current debates that circulated within the daily press. The battles in Italy over control of the Papal States, events that are central to the analysis pursued in this thesis, provide a case in point. The September 19, 1860 edition of *Punch* which takes up these events, mentions several prominent British newspapers which had
covered the Italian situation during the preceding week: *The Nation, The Tablet* (A Roman Catholic weekly), *The Times, The Morning Express, and The London Gazette* were all referenced. The issue surrounding the Papal States in relation to Italian unification had been developing over an extended period of time. However, in late June of 1859, Pope Pius IX declared that the Roman Catholic Church's maintenance of civil power was essential to ensure the continuation of the Church's ongoing spiritual strength. The ensuing struggle over the Papal States (Romagna, Marches, Umbria, and Lazio) which focused on conflict between Papal troops and Independence forces led by Guiseppe Garibaldi, resulted in heated debates in British Parliament and wide coverage in the British press, in part because of the long and explosive history of Protestant-Catholic relations in Britain. Independence of the Papal States was perceived by the British as the only barrier standing between Italy's achievement of a free and just government, and economic and political prosperity. Yet within the Catholic community in Europe and Britain, the Church's spiritual powers were viewed as inextricably tied to control over Italian lands. The British popular press responded to the debates in the contested arena of representation. The *Illustrated London News*, which gave extensive coverage to Garibaldi's celebrated 1860 defeat of papal troops in Naples, stressed the paper's own ability to deliver the "facts" through full-page renditions of the events "as they happened" (Figure 3). The detailed images that accompanied textual accounts of Garibaldi's victory served to enhance the *Illustrated London News*' claims to punctilious representation and veracity. The viewer bears witness to everything from the
actual battles in Southern Italy (Figure 4), to the post-victory street celebrations in Naples. In contrast, rather than convince viewers of its authenticity in reporting a foreign event, *Punch’s* power lay in its ability to draw on these circulating forms of representation, and to re-present them in a way that gave form to the journal’s editorial position, while also enabling a range of multiple and ironic readings linked to contemporary issues and anxieties at home.
3 The featured Punch cartoon took up a whole page with the reverse side left blank, as in Philipon’s *Le Charivari*. See R. Goldstein, *Censorship of Political Caricature in Nineteenth-Century France* (Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1989); Speilmann, *The History of Punch*; and Price, *A History of Punch* who also describe the format of the journal’s caricatures.
9 Radway, “‘Interpretive Communities’”, p. 466.
14 Price comments that from the beginning, the editors of Punch were very aware of playing upon the connection to the British tradition of Punch and Judy: “Some contributions were said to be written by Punch himself. Articles discussed the effect of electing Punch to Parliament and even tried to assess his political influence. This identification was made between the paper and the puppet deliberately. “Apart from cashing in on a lot of goodwill, it was probably a wise move for a new paper trying as fast as possible to be taken for an older one.” *A History of Punch*, p. 22.
16 McIntire, *England Against the Papacy*, p. 3.
I. The Press, *Punch*, and the Power of Caricature in Nineteenth Century Britain

This chapter will explore the power of political caricature, in particular, that which appeared in *Punch* magazine in the mid-nineteenth-century and operated in conjunction with the parallel expansion of two lucrative industries in Britain: the popular press and colonial enterprise. Two phenomena will be investigated in relation to the ways in which graphic journalism buttressed the growth of these projects. The first centers on the freedoms enjoyed by the British press, particularly in relation to unforgiving censorship laws that plagued that same institution in France. Notions of the free press in Britain as implicitly measuring the degree to which the government was responsible to its citizens intersects with the second phenomena crucial to graphic journalism: the implicit rhetorical strategies that permitted the “joke”, as a form of humor, to take up commentary not feasible in other printed forms.

i. The Power of Caricature: Traditions of Satire in Britain and France

Caricature was part of a long tradition of satire in Britain that drew upon notions of the free press as the mark of a free society. The proud pedigree of British caricaturists, from Gillray to Hogarth, allowed the medium to voice political critiques that were not permitted in other forms. Through the eighteenth century, freedom of the press was posited as integral to the freedoms under a constitutional monarchy and the smooth workings of British society. E.W. Montague in *Reflections on the Rise and Fall of Ancient Republics* noted in 1759,
Freedom of thought, or the liberty of the mind, arises naturally from the very essence of our constitution; and the liberty of the press, that peculiar privilege of the British subject gives every man a constitutional opportunity of laying his sentiments before the publick.¹

Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Law of England*, written a decade later, reiterated the concept. The press was considered to be part of a checks and balances system that kept state leaders honest, a relationship that was posited as central to the maintenance of a free state.²

The liberty of the press is indeed essential to the nature of a free state: but this consists in laying no previous restraints upon publications and not in freedom from censure for criminal matter when published. Every free man has an undoubted right to lay what sentiments he pleases before the public: to forbid this, is to destroy the freedom of the press.³

Indeed, in the nineteenth-century, these views still held true. William McKinnon, author of *On the Rise, Progress, and the Present State of Public Opinion in Great Britain and Other Parts of the World* published in 1828, emphatically stated that “The form of government becomes liberal in the exact proportions as the power of public opinion increases.”⁴ The press, in this context, was thought to have been one way to measure public opinion, and thus was one of the key factors in the formation of a broader political class in nineteenth-century England.⁵ Historians of graphic journalism in Britain, Celina Fox and Michael Wolff, have suggested that the press contributed to the growth of a Victorian class-consciousness through its role as both an agent and repository for the values and beliefs of its readerships.⁶ Education of the “lower” classes, often in the image of an idealized middle class,⁷ became an important function of the
press, which cultivated values of sobriety, thriftiness, hard work, and piety, all under the over-arching umbrella of self-improvement.\textsuperscript{8} Literacy was on the rise due to educational reforms and new clerical and administrative jobs, which paid little but required the ability to read and write. As such, periodicals addressing the working class flourished. Illustrations in this forum added interest to the text and made it more comprehensible to the viewer (Figure 5 and Figure 6). In the early nineteenth-century, the penny press found a market niche in which crude woodcuts were used to illustrate sensationalized fiction or police reports. These publications were very cheap and seen essentially as "trashy" tabloids, in comparison to the "quality" journalism of daily London newspapers.\textsuperscript{9} It was not until the 1840’s that newspaper stories began to publish pictures to illustrate the subject of the article.\textsuperscript{10} Weekly illustrated newspapers, such as the \textit{Illustrated London News}, adopted this format and used it, not only to allow viewers greater accessibility to the information contained within the publication and to add interest, but as well to suggest an immediacy to the news coverage. The text, in this format, became subordinate to the images, as the latter ostensibly gave information “at-a-glance”, and thus became the most popular feature of this type of newspaper.

Concurrent debates in the British Parliament during the 1830’s over parliamentary reform and censorship of the press added another twist to the power of the illustrated press. Radicals and liberals saw the magazines and their promotion of education for working classes, as representative of the assurance that power was not confined to the aristocracy or politically elite.\textsuperscript{11} Slogans such
as "Knowledge is Power" \(^\text{12}\) splashed across one working class journal testified, in the 1830’s and 1840’s, to the perceived power of the press to educate and emancipate working classes. However, not everyone agreed with this point of view. For while the Janus-faced medium of print championed civil liberties and served as a vehicle for social responsibility and as an educator of the masses, the press could also be seen as a threat to national security by those who favored the limiting of political participation to an educated elite. Magazines such as: The Society for the Distribution of Useful Knowledge, Mirror of Literature, Amusement and Instruction (1822-32), Working Man’s Friend and Family Instructor (1850-51), and comic weeklies like Fun (1861) and Judy (1867), are just some examples of journals which masqueraded conservatising notions of education and improvement as Enlightenment ideals. David Kunzel, for example, has pointed to the ways in which values that were reassuring to a bourgeois public and were promoted in this “working class” literature, were mocked by the Ally Sloper comic strip that emerged in 1884.\(^\text{13}\) The Ally Sloper’s Half Holiday, sold for one pence, and aimed to turn the Victorian work ethic upside-down as Ally Sloper cheated, lied, stole, exploited, drank and lived by his wits, while ignoring organized productive labor.\(^\text{14}\) He wore shabby bourgeois hand-me-downs that emulated the dress of the politically empowered class that most magazines of its type sought to promote.\(^\text{15}\) Thus, while the expansion of the popular press was in some ways indicative of British freedom of speech and as a way of inculcating bourgeois ideologies, it could have the potential to serve as a ground for resistant
representations. The power of caricature as a medium was crucial to *Punch*’s success at mid-century.

*Punch* was modeled on the Parisian journal; *Le Charivari* (1832-93) which was created by the notorious founder of *La Caricature* (purveyor of the infamous *Le Poire* drawings of King Louis Philippe), Charles Philipon. *Le Charivari* began after conversations between Philipon and Honoré Daumier, principle artist of *La Caricature*, during their imprisonment at Dr. Pinel’s mental hospital in Sainte-Pelagie for violating France’s harsh censorship laws during the reign of King Louis Philippe. *Le Charivari* was a daily four-page publication in tabloid format that featured three pages of text and one black and white lithograph located on the third page. Philipon’s adoption of lithography to print his caricatures allowed him to mass-produce high quality, topical images both rapidly and inexpensively. Between 1835 and 1847, *Le Charivari* was the only vehicle for caricature in France that was successfully published continuously, despite repeated attempts by other publishing houses whose efforts were swiftly quelled by censorship laws. Indeed, *Le Charivari*’s sister publication, *La Caricature*, surrendered to the same fate as many others and was forced to finally close its doors in 1835. In France, caricature was viewed as a highly volatile and dangerous medium - one that held untold evils for its victims. “The most fearful and effective of the weapons adopted by the republican against Louis-Philippe was the journal of Charles Philipon: *La Caricature*. It struck him mortal blows”, decried one observer. “Never by pen and crayon was war led with so much life, spirit, verve, and bitterness as that waged by *La Caricature* against the
government. By Philipon on Philippe. 'One of the two had to succumb: La Caricature succumbed, but it left us with an unperishable monument.'\textsuperscript{21} The difference between rules regarding the press and caricature in England and France did not go unnoticed by the publishing community in both countries. The most graphic example of the extremes in publishing freedoms that existed between the two countries occurred in a satire appearing in *Le Pétard*, a French journal on February 2, 1878. The artist, Alfred Le Petit, is shown frustrated beyond belief, reduced to futilely tearing at his hair in response to French censorship laws (Figure 7). The French government made the decision to ban *Punch* in 1877, after it published a critique of President of the Third Republic, McMahon, entitled “Stuck in the Mud” (Figure 8). The cartoon depicts the President knee deep in the mire of monarchical politics despite growing popular support for French republicanism.\textsuperscript{22} In contrast, the familiar figure of “Punch”, representing the British journal of the same name, is depicted as confident and independent, even when faced with the ugly and menacing personification of French censorship - the scissor-wielding old woman, Madame Anastasie.\textsuperscript{23} This sketch brings home the point articulated by the anonymous publisher of *La Caricature Française*, a satirical tabloid-style journal published in 1836 from exile in London. The magazine, although it lasted only six months, attempted, from abroad, to resurrect political satire in the style of Philipon's *La Caricature*. Here, the editor of *La Caricature Française* laments the repressed publishing environment in France, in comparison to the freedom enjoyed by the British press under a constitutional monarchy:
Assassinated on its native soil, *La Caricature Française* retakes a free vigor on the banks of the Thames; under the protective law of a monarchy truly Constitutional. Knowing how to appreciate the inestimable happiness of a certain asylum, *La Caricature Française* will never leave its domain to even slightly glean on the political field of great Britain; *La Caricature Française* will only attack assassins, and subjects for ridicule won’t be hard to find with a peculiar government [the July Monarchy] – fecund mine, inexhaustible mine of cowardice, bragging, of all possible iniquities... *La Caricature Française* will be nobly repaid for its efforts if it contributes to maintaining the horror and scorn which such a state of things inspires in all Frenchmen worthy of this fine name, if sometimes a ridicule well taken leads to an outburst of native gaiety in the saddened hearts of the politically proscribed.24

Censorship in indirect forms, such as the thinly disguised heavy newspaper taxes, also curbed the freedom of the French press. Such taxation, which directly caused the demise of many small publishing houses, was targeted primarily at those who had “contested every principle and scorned every holy truth” through caricature, deemed dangerous as it was available to “the least enlightened elements of the population.”25 One fatality occurred in 1850 with the permanent closure of *Punch à Paris* (named for the already successful British journal) after just six issues were published.26 *Punch à Paris* responded to the new taxation laws and its imminent closure with a caricature that depicted the French *Punch* as so scarred by smallpox (taxes) that his English counterpart could not recognize him.27

These incidents regarding press censorship served to reinforce British stereotypes of France developed over the course of many years of English-French rivalry. These stereotypes represented England as free and enlightened in contrast to the French state where authoritarian rule – of monarchs, revolutionaries or
emperors – was posited as depriving that nation’s citizenry of its liberties.28

Notions of a free British press were consciously formed in relation to this ongoing spirit of British/French rivalry.

This point is vividly illustrated by numerous historical accounts of the way in which, despite vicious lampooning, *Punch* artists and writers were treated extraordinarily well by the politicians they satirized. Members of British Parliament, it was said, were very conscious as to whether or not they had *Punch* “on their side.”29 For instance, John Russell purportedly responded with “charming proof to the statesman’s magnanimity” to a famous caricature in which *Punch* artist, John Leech, depicted Russell’s reaction to Pope Pius’ restructuring of the Catholic churches of England and Ireland in the early 1850’s (“Papal Agression”) (Figure 9):

The object of that Bill [the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill] was merely to assert the supremacy of the Crown. It was never intended to prosecute. Accordingly, a very clever artist represented me in caricature, as a boy who has chalked up ‘No Popery’ upon a wall and then ran away. This was a very fair joke...When my object had been gained, I had no objection to the repeal of the Bill.30

What were the repercussions of Leech’s insulting sketch? Leech received a pension from both Whig and conservative governments, and John Russell reflected some years after:31

Do you remember a cartoon in Punch where I was represented as a little boy writing “No Popery” on a wall and running away? Well, that was very severe and did my Government a great deal of harm; but I was so convinced that it was not maliciously meant that I sent for John Leech and I asked him what I could do for him. He said he should like a nomination for his son to Charterhouse, and I gave it to him.32
Why were these attacks against top-ranking government officials never censored? Why was *Punch* written about by contemporaries as never offending even the most delicate of sensibilities? In part because *Punch* did not attack the basic values of the system of constitutional monarchy, representational government, and responsible rule. Thus, as Lora Rempel has noted in relation to satire in eighteenth-century Britain, while the individual might be attacked, the institution of the monarchy and constitution were left unscathed. For example, although the statesman Russel was lampooned in the “No Popery” cartoon, never is there any question put to the system of representational government. *Punch* was at times shocking, but never did it challenge the stability of social hierarchies, and in this way, was acceptable to the patriotic, educated member of the English bourgeois.

ii. **Funny Business: Jokes, Stereotype, and Imaging the Irish**

The inside cover of the June 1860 Almanac issue of *Punch* (Figure 10) allows the exploration of the magazine’s editorial position through the comic device of the joker, and provides a link between two important issues of the day: the wars of Italian independence - the Risorgimento – abroad, and Protestant British bourgeois anxieties concerning Ireland at home. The Almanac illustration features various characters engaged in the battle over the Papal States in Italy, the struggle within the Risorgimento that was presently of particular interest to Protestant Britain. *Punch* images battles over papal temporal power taking place almost a continent away, by depicting Pope Pius IX and his allies as incapable leaders: goofy, stumbling and inept. Heads of state and religious leaders are
shamelessly ridiculed, with the intent of delighting *Punch*’s British and predominantly Protestant audience. As I will argue, the effect of these particular jokes was to displace mounting internal pressure over a growing Catholic presence in England – a presence which was perceived as a direct threat to British national unity.³⁴ Humor acts in this case, as James English points out in his study of comic theory, to diffuse hostility or tension onto a less-volatile situation, thereby allowing jokes to ‘get away’ with otherwise dangerous or offensive criticism.³⁵

Among the cast of characters represented on the Almanac’s inside cover is, to the left, Pope Pius IX – awkward, foolish, and blinded by his power, a point made literal by the papal mitre that has slipped over his eyes. Behind him is papal ally King Ferdinand II, the recently deposed King of the Two Sicilies (Naples and the island of Sicily) and papal ally, then seeking refuge in Rome. On the right, a priest hovers in the background, and in front of him, two members of the Papal Volunteer Brigades, one of whom is Irish. The volunteer Irish Brigade is of particular interest; it was formed following a call from Rome for military support, and had been sent to defend the northern borders of the Papal States from the liberation armies of Guiseppe Garibaldi. However, once in Italy, they were overwhelmed by the sheer number of Garibaldi’s forces, and having thus met with immediate and disastrous results, were sent home within six months. (*Punch* frequently referenced the Irish Brigade as a laughable bunch of fools whose failure was inevitable.)³⁶
Scattering these characters with his cat-o-nine tails is the British “Punch”, whose inebriated nose protrudes phallically from his face, accompanied by his trusty sidekick, Toby the dog. Drawing on the tradition of the Punch and Judy puppet show, “Punch” is imaged as a drunk, the slap-stick source of comic relief, unaccountable for his irreverent and sometimes violent actions. Yet having said this, he is also powerful. Dressed as a jester, it is “Punch’s” declared “Englishness” which exposes the folly of Pope Pius IX and his entourage. His intervention while a comic foil, thus reveals the “truth” and exposes the ridiculous, ignorant, and false. His presence, in turn, calls up the abilities of the rational bourgeois reader and viewer to discern beneath the surface in a similar way. Although “Punch” offers a critique of foreign Catholic politics through ridicule, “Punch” (as the joker) can assume a relatively safe and stable position because his comments never oppose the social structure in Britain, in fact, they merely reiterate a dominant ideology and this is precisely where the power lies in this insidious representational structure. Through this comic maneuver, Punch can position itself as more truthful than the so-called “objective” journalism that purported to deliver accurate, factual information. It is able to do so because its strategy appears to circumvent social conventions and thus get at the real issue—that is, what everyone is thinking, but will not say. Consequently, the “truth” is revealed to the rational, bourgeois reader who then becomes part of this “shared” joke. It is precisely at this juncture where the success of this strategy hinged: the magazine’s ability to seemingly construct a cohesive community of readers.
Importantly, this semblance of community, which the *Punch* image enacts, illustrates what James English describes as a very significant trope of this strategy:

Comic practice is always on some level or in some measure an assertion of a group against a group, an effect and an event of struggle, a form of symbolic violence. The inescapable heterogeneity of society, the ceaseless conflict of social life, the multiple and irreconcilable patterns of identification within which relationships of solidarity and hierarchy must be negotiated – jokes are never non-tendentious. Even the most trivial piece of wordplay or seemingly nonsensical comic reiteration can function as a sort of rudimentary ‘dividing practice’ (Foucault), as an ‘understanding test’ (Thompson) to distinguish an in group from an ‘out group’ (Martineau) affirming some cultural or subcultural identity and asserting a superiority over non-laughing others.38

Joke-work, then, constructs laughers and non-laughers (different types of communities), separating the ‘in group’ from the ‘out group’. While on the surface, humor may seamlessly define and band together these groups - in this case, the English bourgeois audience - these communities are not in fact homogenous, but instead are pock-marked by difference. Humor’s guileful strategy then, is to efface lines of difference within communities, and put in place the illusion of cohesion and consensus.39

However, in order to explore more fully the implications of the joke within this specific nexus, the broader socio-political framework must first be established. Implicit in the progressive ideology of nineteenth-century Britain that hinged on developing capitalism, was a commitment to colonial expansion that conversely and necessarily denied the formulation of a cohesive national experience. An emergent British nationalism was shaped in direct relation to the country’s colonial activities; that is, difference became the principle way in which
notions of British-ness were formed. Colonial discourse, as historians David Cairns and Shaun Richards make clear in *Writing Ireland*, requires both the presence of a "repressed and rejected 'other' against which the colonizer defines an ordered self", a relationship played out between the subject positions of both the dominant British Protestant in relation to the Irish Catholic.  

The Irish resisted total absorption into the machine of British nationhood along political, religious, and cultural lines. Politically, the Act of Union in 1800, which united Ireland and England under one parliamentary system, was repeatedly challenged throughout the nineteenth-century, particularly by the Repeal Movement of the 1830's and 40's, and again by Fenianism (an Irish nationalist movement originating in the United States) in the mid-1860's. The English denial of Irish self-government went hand in hand with almost two centuries of Catholic repression in Ireland. Concomitantly, Catholicism, in mid-nineteenth-century Britain, was seen as a lingering thorn of difference and the last barrier to England's assimilation of Irish immigrants into London, and on a grander scale, Ireland into the British Empire. Protestant control over Ireland was extremely tenuous and, as Cairns and Richards argue, Catholicism served to sustain a separate identity for the Irish, while at the same time, providing a rallying point around which anti-Catholic alliances could cement their resolve against a common enemy. Against this backdrop, Protestant rule in the nineteenth century could be justified in both England and Ireland as:
The just domination of light over darkness, of truth over error, the
ascendancy of liberty and reason over despotism and arbitrary power.
The supremacy of religion, the arts, the civilization, of Protestant
Britain over the fanaticism, ignorance, and Barbarism of Rome.\(^{41}\)

The constant reproduction of the differences between the colonized and colonizer
was thus necessary to ensure the continual repression of the colonized, and the
superiority of the colonizer.\(^{42}\) In his essay, “The Other Question: Stereotype,
discrimination, and the discourse of colonialism”, Homi Bhabha defines
stereotype as a discursive strategy that “vacillates between what is already ‘in
place’, already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated.”\(^{43}\) In turn,
the colonized must be defined on the basis of their dissimilarity to the colonizer,
imprisoning them at once as a distant ‘other’, “and yet entirely knowable and
visible.”\(^{44}\) Bhabha argues that the body provides the means through which
difference is articulated, and this difference, or ‘signifier of discrimination’, must
continually be made visible:

Whereas representation banishes its object into the unconscious,
forgets and attempts to forget the forgetting, discrimination must
constantly invite its representation into consciousness, reinforcing the
crucial recognition of difference which they embody and revitalizing
them for the perception on which its effectivity depends... it must
sustain itself on the presence of the very difference which is also its
object.\(^{45}\)

Physiognomy functioned effectively as the vehicle with which the British
bourgeois Protestant could concretely translate notions of Irish cultural and
religious difference into visual form.\(^{46}\) In the words of one physiognomist, the
human face was to be regarded as “a book in which all must read, every day and
every hour” (Figure 11).\(^{47}\) The science of physiognomy developed out of the
need to decipher and order the ever expanding and diverse Victorian urban crowd, with its motley mixture of races, classes, and social types (Figure 12). As Mary Cowling argues in her study, *The Artist as Anthropologist*,

“In Victorian England, the encoding of human types through physiognomy, in art, as in life, was a means of bringing order into an ever-increasing, even bewildering variety of human types and social classes: a localized variation of what was being performed on a global scale by anthropologists.”

London, at mid-century, described by historian Robert Young as “heterogeneous to the bone”, becomes a stage in which this visual drama is enacted. Characterized by the appearance and mixing of different social strata and ethnicities, the use of specific caricatural devices centering on tropes of physiognomy not only identified possible subjects of bourgeois anxiety, but also presented these as visible and therefore knowable entities, thus rendering them less threatening. As a result, boundaries delineated along class, gender, or racial lines could be represented as fixed and stable rather than shifting and porous. For example, the urban poor could be portrayed as lazy and homeless or unemployed due to personal choices or genetic defects; women could be imaged as constantly concerned with the trivialities of fashion and therefore, unfit for participation in political life; the French could be depicted as exceedingly thin and effeminate in relation to images of a patriotic, sophisticated, and sober Englishman – representations that left no question in the viewer’s mind as to who had the military advantage. The Irish, in turn, could be pictured as infantile, drunken, and violent. These commonly held assumptions about Irish character when given visible, physical form, reasserted ideas about an intrinsic physical and mental
inferiority (Figure 13). Caricature, within this *mise en scene*, could play a role in colonial discourse in concretely translating Victorian notions of science, ethnicity and progress – literal signs of difference that worked to sustain British hegemony.

*Punch*, as its caricatures scrupulously transcribed the chaos of the modern city into legible form, thus participated in the strategic formulation of colonial discourse, functioning as a site in which power struggles were enacted and dominant interpretations of race and ethnicity reproduced.

In nineteenth-century Protestant Britain, the Irish were stereotyped as of inferior racial origin, a position which in Victorian science, anthropology, and social reform, served to legitimize colonial, political, and economic subjugation, and in turn, the denigration of Ireland’s dominant religion, Catholicism. Punch caricatures that range in date from the late 1850’s to 1880’s, initially depicted the Irish as harmlessly stupid, and as Fenianism heated up in the 1860’s, as apes and possessed monsters (Figure 14). By simianizing and demonizing the Irish, *Punch* depicted this so-called “race” as possessing features that reflected directly on their moral and intellectual capacities (Figure 15 and Figure 16).

Contemporary scientific studies buttressed these assertions, while the new disciplines of criminal anthropology and phrenology utilized meticulous anatomical examinations to substantiate the current social theory regarding this racial, social, and classed ‘other’. Thus, in the 1860 *Punch* Almanac cover illustration, the strength of the Papal States, which in Britain was seen as threatening Unification and the liberation of Italy as a whole, is undermined through its buffoon-like representations of Irish-Catholic support. Of import here
is that neither the daily, or the illustrated press trafficked in such stereotypical formulations linking the papacy to Ireland – nor were they used, as they are in *Punch*, to critique Papal authority. *Punch*’s conflation of the anxieties surrounding the Irish in Britain with the Italian wars of independence, is singular in its representation in that, while the daily illustrated press published prints of victorious battles and Italian revolutionary heroes, Irish Catholic tensions were not referenced within them. Thus, *Punch*, through various comic tropes, identifies the unspoken apprehension that the contest over Papal power in Italy brought to the surface in England, explaining the near obsession of the British media with this particular foreign event.

The cartoon and textual representation, “The Wild Irish in the West” (May 19, 1860) (Figure 17), provides an interesting platform from which contesting colonial knowledges and stereotypical notions of the Irish were launched. The image depicts a black African and a Native American, whose personages assault the viewer with their exaggerated signs of cultural difference. The enormous nose and ear ornaments worn by both figures form simple geometrical shapes whose arrangement rises to the surface of the image, highlighting what is posed as most different about these people. The caricature and title of the article invite a comparison between the Native American and black African (who are imaged) and the Irishman (Celt) (who is evoked in the caption), by amplifying the cultural differences between the reader – the Briton - and these three “races”. A relationship between the Irishman and his absent other, the Briton, is made manifest in the image’s text. It draws an explicit link between alleged Irish
inferiority and an innate incapacity for self-government, a position that was buttressed by contemporary scientific theory (Figure 18). This textual ruse unfolds benignly as a pitch for the abolition of slavery in America, a cause which the British government and the Liberal-leaning *Punch* supported ("American friends, will nothing convince you that Negroes are human beings? Nothing will if the following advertisement will not:"). Yet *Punch*’s visual and textual strategy is nothing if not complex, for following this is a reprinted advertisement for the Boston Catholic newspaper, *The Pilot*, whose editorial position was far removed from that of the London based weekly. *The Pilot* advertises itself as an "Irish Catholic journal of Brilliant Talent, Early Intelligence, Prodigious Circulation, and 20 Years’ standing”, and goes on to praise the paper’s excellent reputation among all the “exiled Irish” in North and South America. *The Pilot* flaunts its ability to circumvent British publishing prohibitions in Ireland and provide a voice for Irish concerns and issues: “...articles are published which, in the present state of the law, it would be dangerous or impossible to publish in Ireland – fearless and out-spoken articles, in which the mask is torn from the hypocritical face of the Irish aristocracy with a hand unpalsied by the apprehension of British penalties, and an eloquent brilliancy that never dims.” In quoting *The Pilot*, *Punch* ridicules the audacity of the advertisement, and in doing so, seeks to reaffirm Irish inferiority. When viewed along with the accompanying caricatures, it becomes clear that the text in *Punch* inverts the images so that the conspicuous signs of cultural differences of the African and American native peoples that, initially, were so striking, become insignificant in comparison to those of the Irish:
The above composition [the advertisement for *The Pilot*]...is the work of human beings. It is the work of Irishmen. All Irishmen—even the creature who composed the above tissue of bombast, bathos, fudge, and falsehood, malevolence, and absurdity—are undoubtedly human beings. Ireland has produced many of our greatest men.

But, now did ever any Nigger under the sun, even with his brain turned by sunstroke, - any delirious Nigger, - any black maniac in the world, - utter such belluine ravings as those which are reduced to writing in the notification foregoing? The faculty of reason is the specialty of man. If you admit in the case of all Irishmen, you must recognize its existence in that of all Niggers, none of whom can be lower than the low Irish who vent such rabid folly as that just quoted. But as every Irishman is white (when he is washed), it is obvious that, if the “peculiar institution” of America is to be maintained, it at least no longer ought to be limited by considerations of color. It should extend to the inferiority of moral and intellectual type, and then it would assuredly include other people than Africans.54

Leaving nothing to the imagination, the text, while advocating the abolition of slavery in the United States, does so via the conflation of the Black slave and the Irishman. An argument is made that there is not any reason why African people should not be given freedom, because the Irish, who are of a much lower morality and intelligence, already have that privilege. The text defines the Irishman as on the fringes of civilization, at the lowest threshold of humanity, and suggests that skin color is not a criterion for moral and intellectual inferiority, because the Irish are “white when they are washed”. It is through this shared “joke” – one that operates within an interpretive community willing to be implicated in this racial and religious intolerance – that a rallying point for a homogeneous British polity was based.

But the text, in the context of British foreign policy on the abolitionist movement, while arguing that African slaves in America were not “lower” than the Irish authors of the article, advocates keeping order and control over the so-
called Irish/Celtic “fringe”, thereby justifying British colonial rule. In this context, the image assumes another level of complexity, and the joke is ratcheted up another notch when America’s former status as a British colony, and its newly independent position as a threat to British commercial activity, are considered. Despite its support for the abolition of slavery in the United States, *Punch* nonetheless viewed the North during the American Civil War (1861-1865) as a “bullying, vulgarly commercial civilization that seemed to be coercing an agricultural, more gentlemanly civilization.” Not insignificantly, the North was also the birthplace of what was to emerge as Fenianism, the Irish revolutionary movement that was founded in the United States in 1858, that fought for an Irish Republic – a direct attack on British sovereignty. In this context, *Punch*’s “The Wild Irish in the West” can be seen not only as an overt reference to abolitionist arguments in the United States, but also as a reaction to the first seeds of Fenianism.

The text of “The Wild Irish in the West” hints at another facet of the representation of the Irish, that is, the Irish Catholic priesthood, constructed in this article as having a greater intellectual capacity than the Irish masses. *Punch*’s article states that at the very least, *The Pilot* recognizes the consequences of publishing anti-British propaganda in England, but sarcastically links what it terms these “sparks of rationality” to the Irish-Catholic clergy. *Punch* then quotes some phrases from the advertisement that it says demonstrate “evidence” that *The Pilot* has “the power of perceiving and apprehending consequences,” but then goes on to assert that these phrases from *The Pilot* “are remarkable, taken in
connection with the circumstance that great stress is laid upon the fact that the

*Pilot* is an eminently Catholic newspaper.” *Punch* then turns to attacking the Pope:

> His Holiness the Pope, in his late edict of Excommunication, adverted, in a precisely similar strain, to the unfortunate truth, that there were certain localities, and those the very places in which the publication of that anathema was most desirable, wherein it would be unsafe to post it. Thus there is some glimmering of sense to be noted in the Pope’s Bull, as well as amid the blunders and balderdash of his peculiar people.

While *Punch* gives credit to the Catholic priesthood and leader of the Roman Catholic Church for being able to discern dangerous from safe situations, it is merely being sarcastic, insinuating instead various (low) levels of intelligence within the Catholic community. Within this Catholic hierarchy however, *Punch* ranks the intelligence of the priests above that of the Irish layman.

Such evocations of the priesthood took several forms. A cartoon called “The Hero and the Saint”, appearing in the September 22, 1860 issue of *Punch* (Figure 19), played on representations of Catholic priests as deceitful. This was a major criticism directed towards the Catholic Church by a Protestant public because it implied, to some, the Church’s use of tricks and false magic to fool its followers, convince them of its authenticity, and maintain its membership. The event the cartoon celebrates is Garibaldi’s recent victory in Naples over papal forces, depicting the “hero” of independence as he forces a priest to step off a cliff - the symbolic end of priestly rule in the southern Italian city. Ancient and cumbersome robes and certain physiognomical conventions - the priest’s bulging eyes, sagging jowls, bulbous nose and clown-like frown - could work to suggest
that the Catholic priesthood is a backwards profession filled with innately crooked characters. This allegation is supported by the function of the two icons the priest carries with him that could, for a British Protestant, stand for blind Catholic devotion to the belief in miracles – the blood of St. Januarius and a “winking picture”. When the cartoon is taken in context with the poem published on the facing page, it is clear that *Punch* tries to represent fraudulent behavior as integral to the functioning of the Catholic faith:

Ye holy knaves, to whom the crowd
In stupid adoration knelt,
To whilst abject heads they bowed,
The blood of Januarius melt:
A greater miracle behold
Than that of simulated gore,
Which melts when hot, congeals when cold,
But which your silly dupes adore.

Ye know how Italy has been,
Thark most yourselves, for weary years,
Of slavery a mournful scene –
A wretched land of Blood and tears.
Her best blood ne’er had ceased to drip,
Her tears continued still to flow,
Beneath the rule of sword and whip,
Since freedom perished long ago.

But now as Garibaldi speeds,
To Italy from hills to shore,
Restoring Liberty, she bleeds
And weeps, except for joy, no more.
False jugglers, he out does your art;
His honest truth excels your lie;
His hand has healed her wounded heart;
Her blood is staunched; her tears are dry.

The first stanza of this verse references the Miracle of the Blood of Saint Januarius, a saint martyred in 305 A.D. at Beneventum, whose relics were subsequently moved to Naples, where they remain today. The blood of Saint
Januarius acquired notoriety for performing large-scale miracles, specifically its ability to ward off natural disasters, like the eruption of Mount Vesuvius - a constant worry for Neapolitan residents. Its main claim to fame, however, was that for more than 400 years, the blood was said to liquefy every May and September when it was placed at the head of the saint or a silver replication of him. The relic became a specific site of contention in the nineteenth century between the scientific community, which continually sought to deny or disprove the miracle of the liquefying blood, and the Catholic community, who based their faith on the regularity of the event's occurrence. Non-believers were converted upon bearing witness to this miracle, and trust was renewed for those who suffered a lapse in faith. The 1910 edition of The Catholic Encyclopedia addresses the controversy surrounding the Blood of Saint Januarius, and goes to great lengths to persuade the reader that the miracle is real:

It is especially this miracle of liquefaction that has given celebrity to the name of Januarius. Let it once be said that the supposition of any trick or deliberate imposture is out of the question - for more than 400 years the dried blood has turned to liquid at various intervals... If it were a trick, it would be necessary to admit that all the Archbishops of Naples, and that countless ecclesiastics eminent for their learning and often for their great sanctity, were accomplices in the fraud; as also a number of secular officials; for the relic is so guarded that its exposition requires the concurrent of both civil and ecclesiastical authority.

What this excerpt from The Catholic Encyclopedia pinpoints is exactly what was so worrisome to a Protestant British public: the alleged fraudulent nature of the Catholic clergy, and the inevitable disaster perceived to be awaiting Italy if the Papacy was to maintain its secular power. A commentary appeared in the English
Protestant publication, *The Times*, that complimented *Punch*’s depiction of Garibaldi’s 1860 victory in Naples, and the consequent liberation of Neapolitans from the stranglehold of what was constructed as a two-face and hypocritical religion:

We hope [that Garibaldi] will posses himself of the mixture called the Blood of Saint Januarius, and cause it to be submitted to a searching chemical analysis, and make the results, whatever they may be, known to the civilized world. It is worthy of the hand which has just emancipated the people from the fetters of temporal oppression to expose one of the grossest and most impudent frauds which even the priesthood of the South of Italy ever practiced on the credulity of a semi-barbarous population.  

Accusations conjured up by the *Punch* image of the blood of Saint Januarius, are matched by the word play on “blood” in the second verse of the poem. Here, the implications of “blood” could range from the bloody warfare waged over papal land to the perceived vice-grip by the Papacy on Southern Italy to the Pious Union of Precious Blood, a group which not surprisingly, exercised a special devotion to the Precious Blood and was especially concerned with expanding Catholic missionary activity throughout the Papal States during the 1840’s and in proselytizing fighting brigands. In 1849, Pius IX extended the feast of the Precious Blood to the whole church, and in 1851, the Pious Union of the Precious Blood was erected in the principle church of the Society in Rome.  

That the poem in *Punch* served to reference a key feature and threat of Pious IX’s papacy - the expansion of missionary activity and strengthening of the order of Precious Blood – aggravated a sore point within the British Protestant perception of growing papal power.
The 1860 poem in *Punch* published facing the cartoon of “The Hero and the Saint”, also calls up a well-known plea issued by Garibaldi in 1849, in which he requested volunteers to join him in his retreat from Rome, offering “blood, sweat, and tears” to anyone who would accompany him. The phrase “A wretched land of blood and tears” then, calls up Rome and the Papacy, and again points to the artificial mechanistic icons used to sustain the Catholic faith - the Blood of Saint Januarius, and the tears produced by the “Winking Picture (the second object the clergyman carries with him into exodus). The “Winking Picture”, serves as yet another example of the alleged coercion and deceitful ways imagery was used by Catholicism to enlarge its congregation. The viewer is shown the back of the painting, revealing that the picture is rigged with a device that makes the painted icon wink or cry.

The last verse of the poem reads: “False jugglers he out does your art; His honest truth excels your lie”, a phrase which points yet another finger to the tricks of the Papacy, and more importantly, to the greater goodness of Garibaldi – who surpasses any miracles performed by the priesthood with virtuous military action. The irony of *Punch*’s accusation is that, in order for it to present a critique of the Catholic clergy claiming its deceitfulness, the journal had to reveal its own insidious rhetorical constructs. This “flaw”, inherent to the medium of caricature, relies upon its viewer’s ability to identify that the representations are necessarily exaggerated and distorted, the very criticism with which in this case, the Victorian journal *Punch*, charges the Papacy.
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Popular opinion in Britain that sympathized with the monarchy and viewed pre-revolutionary sentiments with great suspicion, was cultivated during the French Revolution and still remained in the nineteenth century physically in the form of Madame Tussaud's Waxworks. The “Chamber of Horrors” displayed gruesome relics of The Terror, including severed heads and various instruments of torture, including the ubiquitous guillotine which, during the French Revolution, in Britain became symbolic of the lack of French liberties. As Edmund Burke fervently stated in 1794, “The condition of France at this moment was so frightful and horrible, that if a painter wished to portray a description of hell, he could not find so terrible a model or a subject so pregnant with horror, and fit for his purpose.” See J. Brewer, ““This monstrous tragi-comic scene’: British Reactions to the French Revolution”, pp. 19-20, in: David Bindman, *The Shadow of the Guillotine: Britain and the French Revolution* (London: British Museum Publications, 1989), especially pages 42, 76, and 212.


42 Cairns and Richards, *Writing Ireland*, p. 8. Contemporaneous scientific theory emerging in the 1860’s, which explained British racial origins as the product of a hybrid breeding of races, presented a chink in the armor of colonialism, necessitating even more urgently, the construction of the Irish as an extreme of degeneracy and British identity, in opposition to that, as fixed and stable. See Robert Young, “Hybridities and Diaspora”, *Writing Histories and the West*, (London: Routledge, 1995).
44 Bhabha, “The Other Question”, p. 70.
45 Bhabha, “The Other Question”, p. 79.
46 Physiognomy can be defined as a nineteenth-century scientific phenomenon in which physical (especially facial) features were literally read as though they were directly indicative of moral and mental character. See Mary Cowling, *The Artist as Anthropologist: the Representation of Type and Character in Victorian Art* (Cambridge University Press, 1989), especially “Introduction”, Chapter 1: Physiognomy: the literal view, and Chapter 2: “The rules of physiognomy and their application in the Victorian age”, pp. 1-86; also L.P. Curtis, Jr., Chapter 1: “Physiognomy: Ancient and Modern”, *Apes and Angels*, pp. 1-15.
48 “...the individual might be ‘considered in the light of a placard, hung up on the wall... to be read... Our virtues, our vices, excellencies, failings, culture and barbarism’ clearly displayed for the benefit of those with a knowledge of science”, L.N. Fowler, “How to Read Character”, p. 3 in *Lectures on Man* (1864), cited in Cowling, *The Artist as Anthropologist*, p. 12.
51 See L.P. Curtis, Jr., *Apes and Angels*, and S. Cairns and D. Richards, *Writing Ireland*, for discussions of the construction of the Irish Catholic within Victorian...
scientific discourse, as it was used to bolster developing theories of racial hierarchy and British colonial activities.

52 This is the overall argument of L.P. Curtis', *Apes and Angels*.

53 Evolutionary theory, for example, hypothesized the close connection between the apes and the Irish. Historian, L.P. Curtis, *Apes and Angels*, has investigated the superimposition of evolutionary theory and colonial discourse as it was made manifest in the body of the Irish person – taking the form of the gradual simianization of the Celt in caricature. In the October 18, 1862 issue of *Punch*, an article appears entitled “The Missing Link”, which explicitly positions the Irishman as the evolutionary connection between the gorilla and the African (Figure 19), to the effect of reaffirming familiar social and racial hierarchies. Evolutionary theories helped to muffle fears over an inherent paradox within nineteenth century British middle-class self consciousness; that is, the challenge to traditional class hierarchy that the capitalist ideology of upward mobility posed. Evolutionary theory enabled the bourgeois position to be rationalized, as it allowed one’s social position to change – the station to which one was born was not fixed and final – but at the same time, conceded the inability of those so-called ‘inferior races’ to gain social or economic ground based on their innate ‘primitiveness’. Also see George Stocking, “Victorian Cultural Ideology and the Image of Savagery (1780-1870)”, *Victorian Anthropology* (New York: Free Press, 1987; London: Macmillan, 1987), pp. 186-237. Stocking discusses the reconciliation of religious thought and science at mid-nineteenth-century.

54 *Punch*, May 19, 1860.

55 Price, *A History of Punch*, p. 83. *Punch’s* position regarding the American Civil War reflected that of the majority of Britain’s upper classes.

56 Cairns and Richards, *Writing Ireland*, pp. 43-44.


II. Representing Catholic-Protestant Conflict in Britain: Catholics vs. Garibaldi & the Risorgimento in the British Popular press

The wars of Italian independence in the nineteenth-century figured prominently in the pages of *Punch* and other forms of the British popular press in the late 1850's and in the early part of the next decade. The *Risorgimento* was fought with the aim of uniting all of the independent provinces of the Mediterranean peninsula under a centralized government. Advocates of Unification sought economic and social reform, trade benefits, and power in the international political arena. Although officially British foreign policy was neutral, sympathies within the Whig government were decidedly pro Italian Unification and anti-papist. However, not everyone endorsed the physical reworking of the nation, as Risorgimento supporters met resistance from the Church of Rome which, at the time, governed four central Italian states: Romagna, Marches, Umbria, and Lazio. When Pope Pius IX declared that maintaining civil power was the key to maintaining strong spiritual power in June of 1859, he was articulating the threat Italian Unification posed as a major challenge to the status, power and future of pontifical might. Of equal import were the implications that either the maintenance or the loss of this power would have in Britain. Thus, the issue of papal temporal power became very central to the ways in which the events of Unification played out in the contested public sphere of representation in Britain. The Italian crisis sparked a public debate that preoccupied British parliament, the press and general pamphlet circuit between 1858 and 1864. Headlines from contemporary English Catholic newspapers announced the urgent need to retain papal lands, and prominent Catholic authors published books with
titles underlining the crisis at hand: *Rome: its rulers and institutions* (1857), *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (1862), and *His Holiness Pope Pius IX and the temporal rights of the Holy See as involving the religious, social, and political interests of the whole world* (1859). In contrast to Catholic publications, papal control over the contentious issue of secular power was represented by the [Protestant] British press and articulated in political circles in very different terms, as it was understood as barring the "moral and material progress of mankind." Since a key tenet of British notions of good government and nationhood posed the king or queen as the head of both church and state, symbolically uniting the two in the body of the monarch, the problem that papal control over the secular presented to the Protestant British State was serious. Not only did it challenge the power structure of the Protestant state, but the debates over papal authority also aggravated tensions in London and other British regions, between Protestant and Catholics. Particularly at issue were over 200,000 landless Irish labourers—largely Catholic—who immigrated to England between 1845 and 1855, as a result of the Famine.

This chapter will trace out the ways in which the British popular press, in particular *Punch* magazine, represented the Risorgimento by drawing a direct relationship between the wars of Italian unification and Catholic-Protestant conflicts at home. A number of factors that made this foreign issue resonate for a domestic public will be explored. For example, large numbers of Irish immigrants flooding British cities and the revival Catholicism experienced during the 1840's and 1850's were perceived by many as a threat to Protestant British
notions of just government. In the face of colonial expansion and empire building, these developments were in turn viewed as a detriment to the seamless ideological cohesion of Great Britain. The perception of Catholicism as a major overriding difference between the English citizen and colonized subject in Ireland was thus presented and understood as the major barrier to carving out a united nation. As Anglo-Irish writer Sir Samuel Ferguson claimed in 1833, “Only if the ‘deluded’ people could be freed from the Irish priesthood [who] hold the hearts of their seduced victims in even firmer bondage than their minds, could a nation be created.”

Within this context, *Punch* magazine served as a site where competing representations of different class and ethnic groups worked to shape bourgeois notions of British identity. Irish historians and colonial theorists, David Cairns and Sean Richards point out that British identity in the nineteenth-century was articulated in terms of difference, and as such, needed to be perpetually reproduced in order to be sustained. As will emerge, *Punch*’s attempts to present an ordered and controlled interpretation of contemporary events for a predominantly Protestant bourgeois British public, belied the strained and slippery class and race relations that marked mid-nineteenth century Britain. Thus, in *Punch*, representations of the Irish immigrant worker, Catholic priest, Pope Pius IX and Garibaldi are made palatable by various means, in order to appease the publication’s viewers and perpetuate a myth of colonial hegemony, which sought continually to retain Protestant British control over Irish Catholics. *Punch* engages in colonial discourse which constructs contesting knowledges of these
polemical figures (the Irish worker, the priest, the pope and Garibaldi) in order to serve the ongoing ideological interests of a unified nation state.

i. Catholic-Protestant Tensions in Britain

An examination of the rise in religious and racial tensions in London in 1860 is useful in order to understand why Punch focused so heavily on the Italian situation. The conflict in Italy derived its currency in Britain from more immediate concerns centering on perpetually volatile English-Irish relations and perceived threats to the Church of England from a recent resurgence in Catholicism in Britain. For this reason, public opinion in Britain overwhelmingly supported the idea of a judiciously governed Italy, free from the influence of British nemeses, Austria and France, and the perceived despotic rule of regional kings and a corrupt Papacy. Elite social circles in London included a prominent contingent of exiled Italian literary and revolutionary figures, including Giuseppe Mazzini, author of the original ideals of the Risorgimento. These Italian liberals brought to Britain accounts of political tyranny and complaints against popery to British social elites, cementing support for the so-called liberation. The genteel tradition of the Grand Tour that carried into the nineteenth-century, also provided opportunities for first-hand observation of the "black hole" into which Italy appeared to have fallen. A nostalgic longing for a country imagined as the pinnacle of civilization and the birthplace of marvels of architectural engineering, art, and culture caused contemporary visitors to conceive of papal rule as oppressive and intolerable. They enthusiastically rallied to the cry of liberation.
leaders who promised a return to Italy’s former glory days. In 1860, Lord Shaftsbury, wrote to the Prime Minister of Piedmont-Sardinia, Camillo Cavour, one of the liberation leaders, declaring, “Your revolution is the most honourable and the most unexpected manifestation of courage, virtue, and self control the world has ever seen.” Cavour championed laissez-faire principles of capitalism, which he had studied in England, and instituted them while he was Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, and Finance for the Piedmontese government in the 1850’s. Cavour was, to both Whigs and Tories, accomplishing what Britain desired most for Italy: carving out the new nation in the very image of England itself. While Cavour championed a constitutional monarchy, promoted free trade, improved transportation systems, and modernized agriculture, his most significant contribution in British eyes was that he resisted papal governments who were considered by many to be the “epitome of political and religious tyranny and economic backwardness.” Pope Pius IX in particular, inflamed Protestants and liberal sympathizers with his staunchly conservative approach to progress and aggressive re-organization and expansion of the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain.

Debates within the Church of England itself, centering on concerns over the Oxford Movement – a faction within the Church of England that proposed a lineage dating back to early Christian times, and called for a return to the teachings of the High Church of the seventeenth-century - also intensified anti-Catholic sentiment and brought the issue to the forefront of the British media. Establishing their official policy in 1833, the Oxford Movement, which was also
referred to as Tractarianism, consisted of a small group of intellectual theologians at the University of Oxford. Their theoretical writings (Tracts for the Times, 1833-41), calling for a return to the origins of Christianity within the Church of England, advocated the adoption of a particular Catholic standard that created great controversy and tension among the Protestant community. At odds were diverse mentalities regarding the Protestant ethics of material progress, industrialism, and enlightenment. Tractarians repudiated these values and instead pointed out the decadence of past and present epochs in comparison with the age of Christian antiquity. In his most controversial essay, J.H. Newman, a founder of the original movement, stated that the “living, modern Church of Rome was the ultimate depository of doctrinal truth.” Coupled with the renewed and vigorous presence of Catholicism in Britain, the Oxford Movement sharpened public awareness of any Catholic presence within the nation.

To add to this, the altercation surrounding a collection of essays by seven authors closely associated with the Oxford Movement posed another challenge to the Church of England. The Essays and Reviews (1860-61) combined evolutionary theory with theology; at stake was a belief in the unquestionable spiritual mysticism associated with Catholicism now linked to materialist philosophies. Immediately after its publication, the essay collection was violently denounced for its liberalism and condemned by the ecclesiastical courts, as according to one bishop, it contained “teaching contrary to the doctrine received by the United Church of England and Ireland in common with the whole Catholic Church of Christ.” On March 2, 1861, a page in Punch linked the
Essays and Reviews controversy with contemporaneous events in Italy, juxtaposing the Italian king, Victor Emanuel shaking a scorpion out of his boot with a text that addressed the Essays and Reviews debate (Figure 20). The presence of both the Italian struggles and the Essays and Reviews on the same page conflate and provide visual form to these two major challenges to the Anglican Church of England: Roman Catholicism and scientific thought. As George Stocking has pointed out, mid-century was a crucial time for the ongoing reconciliation of religion and science, when “even those who supported evolutionary theory did so under the rubric of a divine plan.”

As it happened, February of 1861 marked the last of Garibaldi’s successful efforts to annex all of southern Italy in the name of Unification. The cartoon in Punch of March 2, 1861, “The Italian Boot”, marks this event by picturing the final expulsion of an Italian leader reviled by a Protestant British public. The anthropomorphized “Bombino”, King of Naples and close papal associate, is depicted with the body of a scorpion being “shaken” out of the boot that is the newly united Italy. The humorous image is meant to suggest the thin political threads that held the new kingdom together, and Victor Emmanuel’s irritation with the persistence of the vile little insect that prevents him from smoothly taking control of his new nation. The image points not only to the resistance of governing papal factions to Unification, but also to their large popular devotional following, especially in Southern Italy. Although the sting of the scorpion is potentially fatal, Victor Emanuel seems more annoyed than afraid of him, as he easily shakes the offending arachnid - and symbolically all the backwards
economic, scientific, and social policies of the old Italy - from his boot. Below this image is an article on the *Essays and Reviews* public debate, introduced by a caption which reads “Instead of Which and Not Only”. *Punch* quotes a supporter of the *Essays’* condemnation, the Bishop of Durham:

“It will, be in great measure, by our Christian earnestness, and by our Scriptural teaching, that we should guard the unwary from being led into paths of such dangerous speculations, and show our abhorrence of opinions which I from my heart consider not only to be detrimental to the best interests of morality, and derogatory to,” here the Bishop uses words equivalent to Scriptural revelation—“but which are so manifestly opposed to the truth as it is in” — here his Lordship names the Author of Christianity.

The article goes on to discuss the peculiarities of the uses of “not only” and “instead of which” in the tribunal proceedings of the *Essays and Reviews*, in a way that trivializes the arguments made by the ecclesiastics for their rejection of the essay collection. Besides its spiritual skepticism, the *Essays and Reviews* battle called to the forefront the sensitive issue of censorship, prompting one of the *Essays’* authors to comment:

We do not wish to do anything rash or irritating to the public or the University, but we are determined not to submit to this abominable system of terrorism which prevents the statement of the plainest facts and makes true theology or theological education impossible.

*Punch* makes a double reference to the issue of freedom of discussion and the comparatively free state of Britain and the press as a hallmark of that freedom, by borrowing a technique used in France to frustrate censorship authorities. That is, when an image was banned from publication, in its place would appear a description of the cartoon, or an allusion to what was forbidden to be published,
presented in a way so as to circumvent the law (Figure 21). The technique *Punch* uses here is similar to the French device, in that it interrupts the Bishop’s speech with descriptive phrases that substitute for words allegedly prohibited by the Anglican Church, calling into question the stifling power of the Anglican religious authority. Herein lies the power of *Punch* as it points to the irony of the *Essays and Reviews* debates: the same criticism levied towards Catholicism, the Tractarians and Papal governments in Italy – that they resisted progress and science in favor of mysticism – is exactly that of which the Anglican church is guilty in their condemnation of the theological expositions.

To add to the problems erupting within the Established Church of England, aggressive directions taken by Pope Pius IX led to both the emergence of a papal policy antithetical to British notions of good government, and a renewed Catholic presence in Ireland and England. Pope Pius IX held a strong anti-progress mandate and implemented directives in the 1850’s to consolidate papal power. He attempted to centralize the Catholic Church in Rome, standardize the mass, and expand bishoprics and colleges, including the Irish College in Rome. For Protestant Britain, the hardest blow was dealt when Pius IX appointed Cardinal Cullen as Archbishop of Dublin in 1852. During his thirty years as Archbishop, Cullen made many changes and led the reorganization of the Irish Catholic Church; these actions directly instigated a renewed commitment to the Catholic faith in Ireland. Similarly, in England the appointment of Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman as the first Roman Catholic archbishop of Westminster (1850-1865) constituted a Catholic Renaissance of sorts in England, sparking Protestant
fears as Catholicism gained a visible presence. A particular distressing sign of an increasingly threatening Catholic presence, was that by the end of the 1850’s, the number of Catholic churches and chapels in Britain had increased from 680 to 950, and priests in London became increasingly visible, as their numbers rose from 800 to 1240.23

What is significant to the topic at hand is that the Protestant English perception of Catholic activity within Great Britain was, in turn, inflamed by the presence of the Risorgimento in the media, as it brought the destitute condition of Southern Italy to the British public eye, and served as an example of the tragedy awaiting those who succumbed to the perceived disaster of the “progress of the priestcraft”.24 Public fears were intensified when an English translation of four volumes detailing the misgovernment of the papacy, called The Roman State from 1815 to 1850 by Romagnol exile Luigi Carlo Farini, was published in 1850-51. The author of the translations, prominent politician William Gladstone, conveyed Farini’s nightmarish interpretation of the conditions under papal rule. His descriptions conjured up the image of a people suffocating under “not a breath of liberty, not a hope of a tranquil life.”25

Aggressive Catholic actions and reports of life in Italy inflamed Protestant prejudices and solidly positioned them on the side of the Unification movement, which was represented in the press as a struggle between good (Garibaldi) and evil (papal government). In 1864, Pius IX published a treatise condemning all features of “modern” civilization. His works Quanta Cura and “A Syllabus of Errors” rejected “liberalism, pantheism, rationalism, progress, separation of the
church and state, a free press, freedom of conscience, and civil rights." While Pius' reactionary treatise alienated progressive European governments, the pontiff himself became an object of almost mystical reverence among devout Catholics. While Pius' reactionary treatise alienated progressive European governments, the pontiff himself became an object of almost mystical reverence among devout Catholics.27 Kenneth Woodward, in his study of the process of canonization in Catholicism in the nineteenth-century, cites Pius' introduction of Papal infallibility at the Vatican Council I in 1869, as giving significant weight to the authority of the Pope.28 This perception of the pontiff's great earthly power prompted contemporaries to liken him to "God on earth." Ultramontanists supported Pius' conservative stance on progress, and were also convinced that the maintenance of both spiritual and temporal papal power was critical to the future of mankind. In Protestant Britain, the Quanta Cur a and "A Syllabus of Errors" were at serious odds with liberal parliamentary democracy and the separation of church and state.

The danger Pius posed as he increased the power of the pontifical seat, by attempting to hold onto his political power while simultaneously defining himself as the spiritual leader of millions was answered in Punch by successive representations of Pius IX as completely incompetent. For example, in three images published in Punch - on October 15, 1859; April 7, 1860; and in June of 1860, respectively (Figures 22-23 and Figure 10) - the body of Pius is drawn as a plump, undefined mass hidden beneath heavy pontifical robes. His face simultaneously betrays expressions of frustration, sadness, and confusion. His papal mitre, twice as high as his disproportionately large head, frequently slips over his eyes and obscures his vision. Victorian viewers with an eye for moderation could read this ill-fitting crown as the typically blinding effect too
much power could have on a religious leader. This strategy of representation essentially emasculates the pope; his foggy stupor, round body, and skirt-like robes make him resemble more an aged grandfather teetering on the brink of senility, than the spiritual captain of millions. By enervating the Pope, *Punch* masks the threat Catholicism posed to Protestant Britain; Pius is presented as totally incapable of providing spiritual, much less political, leadership, letting the British bourgeois viewer take comfort in the knowledge that Catholicism could not infiltrate England due to such ineffectual direction. However, of interesting contrast are the representations in *Punch* of Roman Catholic priests that appeared in the September 22, 1860 and June 30, 1860 issues (Figures 19 and 24). As will emerge, the Catholic priests are imaged as clever, conniving, and corrupt—in other words, very real threats to the security of the British Protestant State.

The massive overhaul in strategies of urban missionary activity in London during the 1840's and 1850's contributed to an image of the Catholic priesthood in England as furtive and invasive. In an attempt to reclaim the forgotten faithful and re-institute religion into many destitute Irish homes, the Roman Catholic Church of London, led by Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman, reassessed everything from Church decoration to the method by which sermons were delivered. The interiors of many of London's Catholic parishes were transformed so that, "stations of the cross, groups of the Holy Family, statues of the Blessed Virgin and Saint Joseph, and everything else that may be a source of devotion or enjoyment to the poor" were on display. This strategy, adopted from continental churches, was believed to encourage attendance among the Irish, who saw
"...nothing in their miserable dwelling but wretchedness and desolation, [and] feel the greatest delight...in...all those objects of devotion which gladden the eyes and hearts of Catholics in foreign countries...they, and they alone really enjoy them." However, to conservative Anglican sensibilities, religious objects of devotion adorning the revitalized Catholic parishes were garish and vulgar. They were identified as idolatrous, and were an easy target for an audience already suspicious of the activities of the Catholic clergy. Apprehensions associated with the revival of Catholicism and an Irish presence in Britain are taken up in a cartoon in *Punch* entitled "Kidnapping" (June 30, 1860) (Figure 24).

In the cartoon, *Punch* brings to light the perceived effect of the new icons and church decorations, and the general aggressive and sly ways of Irish and English Catholic priests. "Kidnapping" depicts an Irish Roman Catholic priest on a street that conjures up a modern urban centre in Britain, in the act of tempting an unsuspecting youth into the clutches of the Church. He uses an icon to entice the boy to come nearer. The priest's exaggerated facial features suggest a corresponding morally corrupt character; his heavy eyelids and brows, large upper lip, and unshaven chin participate in the nineteenth-century quasi-science of physiognomy which drew a direct line between physical attributes and moral character. The priest's physical characteristics mark him out as shady, unkempt, and sly. Windowpanes acting as a barrier between the city street and the unknown depths of the church, display Catholic icons disguised as toys. The device of the windows make the distinction between inside and outside explicit.
They highlight the perceived dangers of city streets where unsanctioned transactions between dangerous types and small children have the potential to occur. In contrast to the bourgeois home, here the “inside” does not provide respite from the outside, but rather, is presented as a disguised anathema, its priestly denizens a threat to the microcosm of the state. The cartoon posits the decimating effect an abducted child would have on the tranquillity of the home as the fate of a nation that succumbs to Catholic trickery.

“Kidnapping” makes many references to the theme of deceit, associated with the Catholic clergy by Protestants. Written on the window glass are phrases that advertise the goods contained within: “All sorts of juggling tricks” and “Masks of All Kinds”. Punch constructs the priesthood as made up of swindlers and frauds, dependent on tricks of every kind to conceal their “true” motives – which are here graphically depicted as plucking young children off the street in order to enlarge their following. The text within the image is made explicit through the caption on the facing page of the magazine. The text under the caption “A priesthood with a Hook” reads, “The Roman Catholic priests of Ireland boast themselves to be Fishers of Men. Not content, however, with catching fish, they also crimp them.” In the context of current aggressive missionary activity, the recent adornment of London’s parish churches, and the devotional consolidation in Ireland under Cardinal Cullen, crimp could mean to “recruit by coercion or under false pretenses.” The text and image play off one another as the eye is drawn to the extending finger of the priest as he encourages the child to come nearer. The hook-like finger references the priest as a “fisher of
men”, and also evokes another meaning of “crimp”, which is a bend or hook, another signal of deceit. “Kidnapping” not only addressed the perceived Irish Catholic threat at home, but given Garibaldi’s actions in central and southern Italy against Papal authority, served to juxtapose the threat and lure of Catholicism with Garibaldi, who was typically associated in the same journal with democratic freedom. Thus, while Italy is not conjured up directly in the cartoon, the format of the journal as a whole evokes its presence.

The perceived “invasion” of the British urban centre and its national core by Catholic priests, made manifest in the “Kidnapping” image, was buttressed by strategies undertaken to expand the Catholic Church in Britain. New missions were established in the poorest areas of London, mass communions and sermons were performed regularly, churches were made accessible during the day, and class-segregated seating, discouraging to poor parishioners who could only afford standing room, was re-evaluated. As well, urban priests reconsidered their preaching techniques. Frederick William Faber, an urban priest who devoted his life to working with the poor, thought that the best way to reach the working class was through “a vernacular hymn set to the tune of a drinking song.” He advocated using any means to “get a man out of his sins... whether it is by making him laugh, or by making him cry.” Faber provides one of the best examples of this general commitment among the priesthood to diversify their parishioners. He once pleaded to an apathetic audience to take control of their own salvation by “throwing himself on his knees before them crying, ‘How can I touch your hearts? I have prayed to Jesus; I have prayed to Mary; whom shall I pray to next? I will
pray to you my dear Irish children, to have mercy on your own souls."39 This brand of emotional preaching also found a place on the street. Pioneered by two priests, George Spencer and Father Gaudentius, the svegliarini40 technique was successful in delivering the Catholic message at a grassroots level. These physical and theoretical changes in approach within the Roman Catholic Church resulted in the conversion or renewal of the faith of many thousands of migrant Irish poor in London. However, they also caused disturbances within the genteel class of English Catholics and posed a threat to the Established church's status quo. Besides violating conservative Protestant stylish sensibilities, upsetting class hierarchies in terms of non-segregated church seating, and providing aggressive and visible reminders of alternatives to Anglicanism, active church membership in slum areas provided a forum in which confraternities and cooperatives could organize.41 These organizations gave a more powerful collective voice to the Irish in London. Naturally then, confraternities whose members represented a large percentage of London's working class Irish, were potentially threatening to labour laws, social hierarchies, slum living conditions, and other physical means that denied them power. Of pressing concern was also the fundraising that these groups did in support of the Italian Catholic crisis, and the volunteer troops they sent to Italy to wage war in defense of Papal lands. When Pope Pius IX issued the call for volunteers in 1860, over 1000 Irish offered their services to form the Papal Battalion of St. Patrick, also called the Irish Brigade.42 However, it was in 1862 that the conflict inherent in the tensions, not only between the bourgeois
Londoner and Irish Catholic, but also between Irish Catholics and the English working class came to a head during the Garibaldi Riots at Birkenhead.

ii. **Garibaldi and Violence in London, 1862-1864**

Overwhelmed by the sheer numbers of revolutionary forces, the Irish Brigade, once in Italy, was badly beaten by Garibaldi’s troops. Their defeat, however, seemed to go unnoticed in the Catholic parishes of London and Ireland, as they were praised extensively upon their return. Relations were aggravated between those who supported the Papal cause and the Protestant mandate of “No Popery”; indeed, a clash was inevitable. Disparaging and insulting remarks made by leaders on both sides incited Protestant attacks on Catholic chapels and subsequent Catholic retaliation. In Belfast, 70,000 Protestants turned up in answer to a Catholic procession in Dublin, and to prove their right to hold demonstrations. Five nights of unrest followed in which Protestant and Catholic houses were sacked, and a leading Catholic priest was stoned.

This preliminary encounter only hinted at what would follow in London on September 28th, 1862. Secularists and Irish Catholics clashed in Hyde Park at a rally of the Workingmen’s Garibaldian Committee. The Secularists, although not adamantly anti-Irish/Catholic, had formed an Anglo-Italian committee for the liberation of Rome and were supporting Garibaldi’s campaign financially. The Times, Daily News, Telegraph, and Morning Post carried police reports of the Saturday riot. This riot sparked successive demonstrations in Hyde Park, including a gathering of over 100,000 people on Sunday, October 4, 1862, and
small altercations in London public houses over the next month. On October 7, an Irish Protestant priest held a meeting to discuss “Sympathy with Garibaldi” in Birkenhead, an area inhabited by more than 5000 Irish dock workers. This cavalier action incensed Irish Catholics and spawned violence on a massive scale, spurred on to greater heights by the police who engaged more participants by going into the side streets. The British press zealously covered these stories, always underlining the ignorant, yet barbarous qualities of the Irish mob. The Morning Star and the Daily News published a sarcastic account of the Irish rioters, emphasizing their unsophisticated and make-shift weapons: “Knowing how well their countrymen fought in Italy… no one will be surprised to learn that they charged again with desperate ferocity, using sticks and stones…” Punch played with these reports in the daily press, by emphasizing the “primitive” nature of Irish fighting techniques, in its “Treatise on the Irish Yahoo”:

They were organised by the Pontifical Government to fight the Italians, at Castelfidardo, where they failed, perhaps from want of sufficient dexterity to handle a rifle… Here they assail the friends of the Italian monarchy with the weapons which come more natural to them: clubs and stones.

The text would resonate for contemporary readers through the references it makes to ongoing news coverage of the defeat of the Irish Brigade in Italy, and to current debates regarding Darwin’s relatively recent theory of evolution. The text describes the Irish as having arrived at an arrested stage of development, lacking the basic physical coordination needed to fire a weapon - a fundamental requirement for anyone hoping to achieve military success. As Michael Adas argues in his book, Machines as a Measure of Men, Victorian society viewed the
type of weaponry a culture used as indicative of it’s level of sophistication.\textsuperscript{52} David Cairns and Sean Richards also argue in their text, \textit{Writing Ireland}, that to counter the rising Fenian movement in the 1860’s and ensure continued British hegemony, contemporary writers used science and evolutionary theories to construct the Irish as a deviant and intrinsically subordinant race.\textsuperscript{53} The Celt, argued to be the racial “stock” for the modern Irish, was described as possessing a “disabling femininity”, mobilizing a nineteenth-century discourse on sexuality that “scientifically” ascribed qualities of emotionality, nervousness, and political and military ineffectiveness to the feminine, effectively rendering the modern Irish incapable and incompetent. Thus while military action, in the typical Victorian definitions of gender roles, was associated with the heroic and masculine, this was not the case in relation to Irish battalions or mobs. In such instances, it became crucial to the maintenance of British dominance that the Irish were divested of martial skills, and that the opportunity was used instead to spotlight just how ineffective they really were at fighting for their cause. These discursive strategies, that is, the process of making the Irish seem inept and primitive, participated in the larger production of colonial knowledge, whereby the ideological aim was to repeatedly construct the colonized “other”, as inherently unable to govern themselves, thereby justifying the ongoing need for British rule.\textsuperscript{54} This process was particularly important in the mid-nineteenth century as the precarious Act of Union of 1800 was constantly being challenged by Irish nationalists, first by the Repeal Movement in the 1840’s, and then by Fenianism, which emerged in the mid-1860’s.\textsuperscript{55}
The riots in London during the fall of 1862, prompted Cardinal Wiseman to respond with an address read out in every parish in London, calling for an end to the fighting. With a great deal of melodrama, Wiseman acknowledged the repression and injustices perpetrated on the Irish over centuries, but pleaded with Irish Catholics to end the cycle of violence. Wiseman’s theatrical prose, according to one Protestant review was offensive. He spoke, so *The Saturday Review* claimed, to his “dear Irish children” as though they were “some soft, flaccid, placid, mild-eyed Tahitian people, full only of gentle thoughts,” an assessment which deployed stereotypes of another colonized “race” – Tahitians - in order to underline what was implied as violent proclivity of the Irish. *Punch* presented the irony of the situation to the Protestant viewer in a cartoon entitled “Cardinal Wiseman’s “Lamb’s” which appeared in the October 25, 1862 issue (Figure 25). The caricature pictures a “pied piper” Cardinal Wiseman playing his flute, oblivious to the brutality behind him. The Cardinal’s smug contentment with the success of his missionary campaigns allows him to remain blissfully ignorant of the actions of his flock. The throngs of Irish poor fighting with each other behind him use sticks and stones; primitive weapons that again conjure up the unsophisticated nature of those who wield them. The rioters are also simianized; the viewer sees only a sea of monkey-like faces, one undistinguishable from the next. This strategy of representation has two effects: it suggests the dangerous, and uncontrolled mob-like tendencies of Irish people in general, and implies as well that the authority Cardinal Wiseman exercised over them was ineffectual. The image also asserts Irish incompetence in military
matters, thereby demarcating the Irish as Britain’s internal “other”, and reasserting the impossibility of Ireland’s independence.

The media’s representation of the Birkenhead incident, while lambasting the Irish poor, also articulated differences within the Catholic community in Britain. A clear distinction was always made in the press between the old English Catholic families and what it constructed as reactionary Papal supporters, and even *Punch* made attempts to clarify its position so as not to offend the “educated Catholic”. 58 Robert Brundrit, an English Catholic priest who convinced his rioting Irish parish to stop stoning a Protestant church in Birkenhead, pointed out the danger of lumping all Catholics together: it could drive “good” Catholics to support the mob. 59 When the riot at Birkenhead was blamed on the insensitive actions of a Protestant supporter of Garibaldi (ironically, an Irish Protestant priest), the Catholic paper *The Tablet*, stressed the unruly actions of the Garibaldians, and the danger of revolutionaries in general:

Sympathy with Garibaldi meant sympathy with the revolution, anarchy, piracy, insurrection, and the defiance of all laws, human and divine... Their faithful instincts told them truly, that the allies of revolutions abroad are, at heart, traitors to the crown and constitution of England. 60

This view was, in fact, shared by many, other than just the monied English Catholic community. 61 Working class support of Garibaldi presented a clear and immediate danger to bourgeois Protestants as well. The 1862 riots in Hyde Park carried special significance, as the park was the site of London trading riots only seven years previous. Since that time, the park had served as a meeting place for the Workingmen’s Committee and had gained free speech associations. After the
Garibaldi riots, the Superintendent of Parks issued an order that banned public gathering in London parks and demanded that police interfere in any "public discussion of popular and exciting topics."\(^{62}\)

iii. The Politics of Hero-making: Representing Garibaldi in England

The Garibaldi riots precipitated the "hero’s" visit to England by two years. His eventual arrival in 1864 evolved into an unprecedented demonstration of pomp and circumstance that attracted every echelon of English Victorian society. Although he was celebrated enthusiastically in public, Garibaldi’s tour was marked by internal conflict, culminating in the cancellation of his trip to the rural parts of England and a mysterious and untimely departure.\(^{63}\) One reason for his premature leave could be attributed to the acid boiling beneath the surface of English/Irish relations. As the Irish had fought with papal troops against Garibaldi’s attack on central and southern Italy, hatred towards Garibaldi in the Irish community was further inflamed when he denounced the papacy to English Protestants during his visit.\(^{64}\) According to one observer, Garibaldi’s visit was "the most refined and deadliest insult which could be directed against all they cherished on earth, and dearer than life itself."\(^{65}\) But, the Irish were not the only group incensed by his presence. In consideration of the riots at Birkenhead and in London, Garibaldi represented somewhat of a ticking time bomb to the bourgeois, fearful that he could incite revolutionary action in England as he did in Italy. It is worthwhile investigating how Punch and other publications constructed Garibaldi
in ways that concealed the mounting tensions between the Irish Catholics in England, the Protestant bourgeois, and the English working classes.

As has been pointed out in earlier sections of this study, the Unification of Italy was perceived by some as the end of a backward economic and social era, and the means by which religious freedom could enter Italy. The Italian revolutionary leader, Guiseppe Garibaldi, was portrayed in Britain by the press as the heroic liberator of Italy from this Papal tyranny. Contemporary commentaries on Garibaldi held him up as a perfect example of unfaltering morality, calling his life "a most powerful lesson of moral and political right and of true practical religion." The Italian leader's immense popularity was used in Britain to sell biscuits, sweetmeats, and clothing, coffeehouses were named after him, and his likeness was sold in the form of sixteen different ceramic figurines (Figure 26).

According to *The Scotsman*, his superstar status incited mobs of aristocratic ladies to maul him at the opera at Covent Garden. Although *The Scotsman*’s agenda is clearly to imply that the English are prone to uncivilized behavior, the terms in which the assault is described also suggest the enthusiasms of religious fervor:

Women, more or less in full dress, flew upon him, seized his hands, touched his beard, his poncho, his trousers, any part of him they could reach... They were delirious with excitement and behaved in the proverbially barbaric manner that Englishwomen of the middle class always do when they are unduly excited and bewildered by anything that they consider splendour... Would any other class of people in any other country under the sun – always, of course, excepting America – conduct themselves in such an indecent manner?

Indeed, Garibaldi became to many in both Italy and Britain, a revolutionary saint. Referred to as "Christ the Second" and pictured many times
in the guise of a saint, supporters claimed that priests and nuns preached his praises from the pulpit (Figures 27-29). A popular cartoon produced in Italy imaged his acceptance into the pantheon of Italian revolutionary saints, which included the likes of Cavour, Mazzini and Victor Emanuel (Figure 30). In Britain, Garibaldi came to symbolize “the worshipful and holy cause of a nation’s redemption, and of the hope of religious liberty through the downfall of the Papacy.” One observer reported how Garibaldi held masses of his devotees spellbound during his entrance into London at the beginning of his 1864 visit (Figure 31-32). The procession wound its way from Trafalgar Square to Parliament Street amidst throngs of spectators:

This of today has been the greatest demonstration by far that I have beheld, or probably shall behold. No soldier was there, no official person: no King nor government nor public body got it up or managed it; it was devised and carried out spontaneously by men and women simply as such; and they often of the lowest grade. It was the work of rough but lawabiding English people, penetrated with admiration for something divine, and expressing themselves as usual in a clumsy, earnest, orderly way. Contemptible as a pageant, it is invaluable for its political and moral significance, and for the good it reveals in the makers of it, and for the good they themselves receive by reverencing a guileless person. How rare, and how beautiful, to see hundreds of thousands of common folks brought together by motives absolutely pure, to do homage to one who is transcendently worthy!

Derek Beales, a historian of the Risorgimento discusses the identification of the working classes with Garibaldi, arguing that workingmen’s associations and freemasons “saw Garibaldi as one of themselves. Their class was ‘the class whom [he] loves and delighteth to honour.’” This association to working men’s groups is further underlined by the Volunteer Rifle clubs’ decision to adopt Garibaldi as their patron saint and emulate his style of dress.
Newspaper, a somewhat seditious journal that addressed working people, proclaimed the Italian leader “the greatest man by whom England has ever been visited.” The fanfare accompanying Garibaldi could symbolize the English commitment to fighting against perceived continental corruption (especially France), and smugly reasserted the supremacy of just [British] government and law.

The Times tried to quiet fears by claiming that “in every country of the continent there may be seen brilliant pageants and well-drilled battalions, [but] only in free England could associations of working men conduct a revolutionary hero through a capital thronged with their own class, and yet not excite fear in the mind of any politicians that danger might spring from the gathering.” However, an item that appeared in the Illustrated London News demonstrated the political tensions raised by Garibaldi’s presence. An editorial in The Illustrated London News reported that it hoped Garibaldi “would not fall into the hands of the ‘working man’ and his friends; not of course... the true working man who is a thinker as well as a worker, but of the mouthing, ranting, mad-headed, confused syllabub of Secularism, Mormonism and decayed Radicalism which is represented by rabid papers and idiotic political writers.”

Punch’s coachman, in an edition of April 23, 1864, offered a somewhat “snooty” point of view, shared by many worried about Garibaldi’s pro-Mazzinian and working class affiliations:
Dis-gusting! The carriage of the Dook of Sutherland, K.G., torn in peeces, if I may be aloud so strong an eggspression, by the beestly mob, drored together to welcum General Garibaldi, wich I ave reason to beleeeve he have no regular Kommishun..[It was] about the beestliest, wust-dress't, and I may say haltgether workin-classedestmob...as I ever see....That 'ere karrige was the British Konstitooshin, the Dook cheek by jowl with a man of low eggstrackshun and revoloctionary principles represented the Lords a-forgittin theirselves and the ouse of Kommons sich as Reform Bills and anti-Corn Law Leegs has made it. 79

Indeed, Garibaldi's activities in Britain did explicitly raise the spectre of revolutionary activity. Despite cautioning by the British government, in the course of his visit to England, Garibaldi met with Mazzini, whom he called "the great apostle of our sacred patriotic cause". 80 The French government of Napoleon III and King Victor Emmanuel in Turin viewed these meetings between two revolutionaries as highly problematic because they saw Mazzini as a danger to sensitive relations between the New United Italy and Austria, which had control of Venice. 81 Mazzini also posed a danger to the delicate social balance between working classes and bourgeois. Although he thought Marxist and socialist thought was dangerous as it promoted incorrect principles of economics, Mazzini recognized the need for more equal relations between capital and labour, and spoke out against the "scandal of existing social relations." To this end, he organised over 750 labour collectives. 82 In the 1860's, he boasted to Palmerston that his Genovese working men's collective had over 5000 members. 83 Mazzini encouraged free health insurance, resource rooms, schools, and libraries within these cooperatives. On a greater scale, he envisioned a Utopian Italy in which purchasing power was more diffuse, and a greater sense of community, cooperation, and social obligation was the foundation upon which the new society
was built. In Mazzini’s view, “the beginning of an immense social revolution which would do more for the brotherhood of man to man than all the eighteen centuries of Christianity have done.” It is no surprise that Mazzini’s conviction that a better life for labourers would result in a better life for all of society was unpopular with those who found their social station thrown into question by these ideals. The Times of London accused Mazzini’s “creeping socialism” of “insisting on the rights of labour, on high wages and short hours and laying upon the government the duty of finding work for those who are unwilling to work for themselves.” Garibaldi’s close association with Mazzini further corroded sensitive relations between the British government, Italy’s new government, and the English working class.

From about 1858 to 1864, Garibaldi made many appearances in Punch and the Illustrated London News. The Illustrated London News frequently published engravings of Italian battle scenes, meant to suggest their timely news coverage and journalistic integrity. When Garibaldi’s visit to England was imaged, it was presented in terms of the festivities surrounding his visit. The engravings in the Illustrated London News depict throngs of jubilant spectators crowding London streets as the “hero” parades past them (Figures 31-33). The image appearing in Punch on September 22, 1860, “The Hero and the Saint” (Figure 19), is typical of this publication’s rendering of Garibaldi. In the cartoon, the stoic figure of Garibaldi is presented as embodying truth, honesty, and justice. The portrait-like realism of the engraving of the Garibaldi figure carved out in meticulous detail the “hero’s” delicate facial features. Indeed what emerges from a survey of
illustrations in the journal is that this type of detailed image is used in *Punch* for every representation of Garibaldi printed in the 1850's and 60's (for examples, see Figures 34-36). His visage somehow eschewed the typical cartoon-like exaggeration of most other characterizations. Indeed, the rendering of the body of Garibaldi in this illustration, could be read as representative not only of the individual, but also of the healthy social body of the Italian state. Through his actions, Garibaldi becomes a personification of progress, economic and social reform – a perfect antidote to the pope’s anti-progress mandate. Juxtaposed with the sickly and hastily sketched out body of the priest in *Punch*'s “The Hero and the Saint”, Garibaldi as representing the clean social body, can be seen as representative of a priest-free Italy - or at least an Italy in which the papacy does not interfere in affairs of the state. In “The Hero and the Saint”, the success of Garibaldi’s troops in freeing the Papal States from the corrupt rule of Catholicism is alluded to, as he firmly points the way out of Italy for the priest who is about to walk off the edge of a cliff.

That Garibaldi emerged as a kind of popular saint has precedence in the patriot saints French Revolutionary figures like Marat and Le Pelletier. In these cases, the revolutionary heroes were used in the ideological transformation of the post-revolutionary nation. Worship in the new Republic took place using traditional forms of religious rites and ritual that replaced martyrs of Christianity with martyrs of the revolution. There are similarities between patriot saints in the French Revolution and Garibaldi’s saintly construction, as he also consolidated a devotional following in the new kingdom. However, the major
difference between Garibaldi and Marat and Le Pelletier is obviously that the latter two actually were martyred for the revolutionary cause and their deaths became the basis of a subsequent republican religion. Garibaldi did not sacrifice his life for his cause, although he was wounded in the ankle at the battle of Aspromonte in 1862. Interestingly however, this injury was actually discussed as though it was an act of supreme self-sacrifice and martyrdom, transforming the blood soaked stretcher that carried him off the battlefield into a venerated relic, and contributing to the myth of Garibaldi as a revolutionary hero. As well, popular images circulating in Italy, which depicted Garibaldi as a Christ figure bestowing a blessing and as Christ on the cross (Figures 27-29) contributed significantly to the idea of Garibaldi as a true martyr. Thus, Garibaldi’s “sainthood” participated in the ideological support for Unification, which in order to modernize the nation, needed to purge one of the greatest symbols of backwardness – the papacy and the southern Italian priesthood. As such, using a traditional set of religious vocabularies, Garibaldi was constructed as the modern messiah who brought a new age of reform to an oppressed people (Italians). For a British audience battered with reports of Irish and working class uprisings, the Punch images acted as a reassurance that Catholicism was not gaining ground, offering Garibaldi as the new spiritual leader who was simultaneously a champion of reform and of British ideals of progress. To the Protestant bourgeois in Britain, Garibaldi’s image in Punch effectively masked Irish and working class discontent, and instead offered a soothing image of safety and control, witnessed by the reports of almost unearthly power he had over the masses.


Catholic newspapers such as The Tablet and Universe were notable for the way in which they promoted the papal position on temporal power. A number of books that promoted the papal cause were also published: John Maguire, Rome: its ruler and its institutions (London: Brown, Green, Longmans and Roberts, 1857); Henry Edward Manning, The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ (London: Burns and Lambert, 1862), and M.J. Rhodes, His Holiness Pope Pius IX and the temporal rights of the Holy See as involving the religious, social, and political interests of the whole world (London: Thomas Richardson, 1859). (Cited in McIntire, England Against the Papacy, p. 26).

McIntire, England Against the Papacy, p. 3, claims that this was a basic aim of British foreign policy, and that actions taken towards the pope were understood to promote this policy.


Cairns & Richards discuss the problem of the Protestant Irish subject (the Anglo-Irish Ascendancy – a very socially and politically elite group), whose entry into the territory of the colonized is complicated by their identification with this same “other” and the nation of Ireland – thus making it impossible to establish a singular concept of nationhood and the Irish citizen. Cairns & Richards cite the 1832-33 writings of Sir Samuel Ferguson, “A Dialogue Between the Head and Heart of an Irish Protestant” and a 1858 letter to his friend which emphatically stated, “I am an Irishman and a Protestant... I was an Irish man before I was a Protestant”. From Robert O’Driscoll, An Ascendancy of the Heart: Ferguson and The beginnings of Modern Irish Literature in English (Dublin: Dolmen Press, 1976), cited in Cairns and Richards, Writing Ireland, p. 25-27. Chapter 2, “Pages like this our field” of Writing Ireland discusses the Anglo-Irish Ascendancy, pp. 22-41.

Anglo-Irish writer Sir Samuel Ferguson, “A Dialogue Between the Head and Heart of an Irish Protestant” (1833), cited in Cairns & Richards, “Pages like this our field”, Writing Ireland, p. 28

C.T. McIntire, England Against the Papacy, p. 3. McIntire gives a detailed account of the delicate balance of power negotiated between Britain, France and Austria.


McIntire discusses the numerous Italian literati and republicans who took refuge in London during the 1850’s. He also cites prominent London citizens who went to Rome on the Grand Tour and returned with horror stories of political and religious injustices. The most influential of these tourists was William Gladstone who, upon his return, translated into English four volumes of Luigi
12 McIntire, England Against the Papacy, p. 3.
14 The Controversy came to a head in 1845 when J.H. Newman, one of the founding members of the Oxford Movement, renounced Protestantism and was accepted into the Church of Rome. Ritualism and the use of icons were also at issue and were criticized by other factions within the Church of England. Nockles, The Oxford Movement, pp. 25-26 and p. 144.
20 George Stocking, Victorian Anthropology, p. 190.
22 McIntire, England Against the Papacy, p. 24.
23 McIntire, England Against the Papacy, p. 25.
24 McIntire, England Against the Papacy, p. 25.
28 Woodward, Making Saints, 313.
29 St. John Bosco: “The Pope is God on earth. Jesus has set the Pope above the prophets, above his precursor, above the angels. Jesus has placed the Pope on a level with God.” Also, the Jesuits in Rome compared Pius to: “Christ, if he were himself and visibly here below to govern the church.” (Cited in Woodward, Making Saints, p. 314).
30 Cairns & Richards, “An Essentially Feminine Race”, Writing Ireland, p. 48-49. The authors use Foucault’s analysis of the discourses on sexuality to analyze how
constructs of femininity in the nineteenth-century were used to assert passivity and dis-empowerment.


38 Ibid.

39 Ibid.

Svegliarini is defined as “emotional preaching in the streets”, originally practiced in Italy. Gilley, “Catholic Faith of the Irish Slums”, p. 838.


45 Ibid.

46 George Jacob Holyoake led the Secularist working man’s movement in Britain. The Secularists were supporters of European nations under the rule of Austria and France. They published less anti-Irish and anti-Catholic propaganda than most of the British press in general. See Gilley, “The Garibaldi Riots”, p. 704.


54 Cairns & Richards, ibid.

55 For an general overview of Irish/English relations, see D. George Boyce, Nineteenth Century Ireland: The Search for Stability (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan Ltd., 1990); Lawrence J. McCaffrey, The Irish Question, 1800-1922 (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1968); also Cairns and Richards, Writing Ireland.


“Mr. Punch need not for the 100th time assure the educated Catholic that nobody supposes him to regard such publications [the popular Catholic press] with other than Mr. Punch’s own sentiments.” See Figure 1 - Punch, November 29, 1862. (Cited in Gilley, “The Garibaldi Riots”, n. 192, p. 722).


For a discussion of power hierarchies in Ireland, see Cairns & Richards, “What is my Nation?” Writing Ireland, pp. 1-21.


Beales, “Garibaldi in England”, passim.


Smith, Mazzini, p. 168. Smith explains that the significance of the Garibaldi pottery was that his contemporaries, like Dickens, Palmerston, Tennyson, or Mazzini, were not represented in such a form.


Gustavo Sacerdote, La vita di Giuseppe Garibaldi, (Rizzoli & Co.: Milan, 1933). This book contains three images of Garibaldi-Christ, including a blessing Garibaldi-Christ and Garibaldi on the cross surrounded by principle members of the Italian government and Pope Pius IX and Napoleon III dancing with joy (p. 23 and p. 843). It also contains lithographs from the Illustrated London News which depict the enormously crowded street processions as Garibaldi makes his entrance into London during his 1864 visit to Britain. Arthur Munby, an observer and clerk in the Ecclesiastical Commission Office cited in D. Beales, “Garibaldi in England”, p. 190, reported that it took over three hours for Garibaldi to wind his way from Trafalgar to Parliament Street.


Quoted in Beales, “Garibaldi in England”, p. 190.


D.M. Smith, Mazzini, p. 168.
Smith, *Mazzini*, p. 168-169. Mazzini was, at the time, pushing King Victor Emmanuel to support his plan to reclaim Venice from Austria. The King was worried that meetings between Garibaldi and Mazzini would result in the revolutionary leaders invading Venice and upsetting the delicate relationship between Italy, France and Austria. Fears and suspicion were justified on both sides as Mazzini did negotiate with Garibaldi to prepare 300 troops to invade Austrian territory in the Northern Adriatic, and Victor Emmanuel formally renounced the overall aim of the revolution, which was from the start to unite the entire peninsula. To signify this political maneuver, he symbolically moved the capitol from Turin to Florence.


Ibid.

Ibid.


Beales, “Garibaldi in England”, p. 184-85. Beales lists Garibaldi’s red shirts, locks of hair, the bullet that wounded him at Aspromonte, and the stretcher on which he was carried from the battlefield, as among a number of articles venerated by Garibaldian devotees. See G. Sacerdote, *La vita di Giuseppe Garibaldi* for an interesting collection of images which picture an injured Garibaldi still assuming a leadership role and offering advice despite his own grave injury.
Conclusion

This thesis emerged from my interest in three or four caricatures in *Punch* magazine that depicted the events of Italian unification taking place in the mid-nineteenth century. "The Hero and the Saint", "The Italian Boot", both of 1860, and images of Garibaldi and Pope Pius IX produced between the years 1859-1864, seemed to occupy a prominent place within the pages of the comic journal. However, during the course of my research, what gradually became clear was that these images, while at face value imaging a story concerning Italian affairs, on a deeper level, also referenced issues that were inseparable from British notions of identity and self-representation. That *Punch* picked up on Italian nation building, and indeed, that this topic resonated within a nineteenth century British public, thus emerged as indicative of Britain’s involvement in the very process of its own architectural design. This led me on an investigative path to determine the socio-political climate in which the journal *Punch* operated.

A discussion of *Punch* necessarily required an examination of the establishment of the periodical press in Britain, as it functioned as a marker of changes in urban communities taking place in the nineteenth-century. New forms of print media mirrored and shaped the growth of the modern city, characterized as it was by shifting class definitions, and rapidly expanding technology and industrialization. These factors, in turn, contributed to a new concept of self and community in which the forces of immigration, international trade and colonial ventures constantly tested and re-worked the boundaries of Victorian Britain. The preceding chapters of this study have explored several ways in which *Punch*,
operating within this particular socio-political climate, served as a site in which religious and “racial” tensions in Britain, and current debates about science and progress, were articulated through images of Catholic figures, both domestic and foreign.

Importantly, the Risorgimento taking place in Italy during the early 1860’s registered, in the British press, just one chapter of the long and discordant history that circumscribed British Catholic-Protestant relations -- a dynamic still under negotiation today. As Punch interpreted the geographical and political building of modern Italy, it evoked the ongoing and simultaneous process of Britain’s own self-definition and portrayal. The challenge to papal temporal power that was posed by Garibaldi and the independence movement, allowed British ideological interests to capitalize on circulating beliefs about race and ethnicity, which were often buttressed by scientific research. This, in turn, informed the discourse in which the Punch caricatures participated. Images of the Irish and Catholic needed to be re-presented as different and anomalous in order to confirm the threat both were understood to pose to cohesive notions of nationhood, whether at home or abroad. At the same time, such images could serve to assure the Protestant bourgeois viewer that such threats were under the guiding hand of paternalistic British control. Punch’s representations of Irish Catholic immigrants, the Catholic clergy, the Pope, and military leader Guiseppe Garibaldi functioned in relation to this social, economic and political crossroads at mid-century. The weekly’s images of simianized Irishmen, heavy-lidded, suspiciously sneering priests, or of Garibaldi’s celebrated 1864 tour of Britain were wrapped in a visual
vocabulary that resonated not only to readers of *Punch* in nineteenth-century
Britain, but through the very fabric of national culture itself.

The function of this study’s mapping of *Punch*’s representational
strategies – and in particular the use of humor and the joke to imply a community
of readers “in the know” - thus has been to suggest some of the ways in which
nineteenth century discourses tried to forge a seamless polity, one in which
Catholicism was presented as a barrier to British notions of progress and freedom.
Yet as the Garibaldi riots in 1864, growing Irish nationalist movements
throughout the 1860’s, and the political claims of Irish who were Protestants or
English who were Catholics would ultimately make clear – a seamless polity
could be claimed only in representation. It is, however, that effort to forge such a
polity through the caricatures in *Punch*, and the ironic and dangerous humor they
employ, that has been the study of this thesis.
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NEWS FROM AND FOR THE UNIVERSE.

As usual, we propose to procure for Roman Catholic literature the widest publicity possible. Mr. Punch, who always goes in the most direct way to work, reproduces, in his world-read page, such spirit words as seem to us not omitted by the nature of the subjects discussed, or by the manner of discussing them. For instance, he does not say that ali poebris of profanity, malice, and vulgarity, the staple of "popular" Roman Catholic journalism. When, however, he comes upon tolerably well-written parts of the ultramontane monster, he lets out its "Iex Expositor" the "lut."

But the conviction that the more widely Papal literature is read, the more the interests of humanity will be served.

The London organ of the ultramontane (Mr. Punch need not for the hundredth time assure the educated Catholic that nobody supposes him to regard such publications as with more than Mr. Punch's own sentiments) is peculiarly rich just now, the writers being excited at the triumph of Irish patriots over English meetings, and by that of foreign guests over the Patronage of the French. In the Universe, No. 103, Vol. IL now lies (in every sense of the word) before Mr. Punch. He who would see the English readers should imagine that the journal is merely a product of the gentleman's forethought; conventions imagination, he began; but in the interest of the world, that the Universe is printed and published by D. LAXE, 45, Lamb's Conduit Street, London, on the left side hand as you approach CAPTAIN CORH. It is a folio of eight pages, and is devoted to the interests of Catholics.

Mr. Punch has picked up a great deal of valuable information, besides deriving much harmless amusement from a perusal of the contents. He strongly recommends the Catholic organ to Protestant readers and, by way of tempting them to patronize it, he offers them a few selections from the number before him. The first page is given to a Catholic calendar, on which Mr. Punch will only remark, that one of the days is set apart for "Plenary Indulgence and Abstinence," and he would like to know how the two things can be accomplished at once. Perhaps the indulgence is to take place at a jolly good early dinner, and the abstinence afterwards, which is very rational, and beneficial as regards digestion. We scarcely like to quote more, yet here is another scrap of what American news fairly does, and probably cribbed from a Protestant journal. But then we come to the cream.

There is an article upon the close of the International Exhibition. To avoid excusing himself to the building, but goes into politics and other matters. He says, inter alia:—

"The Universe of the Papists possesses one quality which is not always to be found in one's companions,—he is able to get his own living if he were kicked off the throne to-morrow, and Tom Nokes often told me that his seat to be an accomplished knight of the sword, and as useful a son of a Christian ever took a closing awl, or a thimble in his hand. This is what the world of the ultramontane, and few men possess more of it than Louis Napoleon. One of the wisest things he ever did was to take the stroke-oar in the bark of St Peter, and so, in the dust."—

We are sure that the Universe will forgive the slight familiarity of this paragraph for the sake of the political advice, and of the information that he is now pulling stroke in the "back" of Saint Peter.

"Wife at the prow, and Pontiff at the helm."—

The Universe. November 29, 1862.
Fig. 5. Cover from *The Working Man: A Weekly Record of Social and Industrial Progress*, May 5, 1866.
JOSEPH MAZZINI, THE ITALIAN PATRIOT

The European convulsions of 1848 raised up many men of politics, energy, and enterprise, who had long been
obscured in obscurity, and had been forced from their
native countries by the tyranny of crowned despots.

Amongst the most conspicuous of the heroes of liberty
was Joseph Mazzini, whose name is etched in every
heart of freedom by the noble struggle he made for the
release of the Roman people.

Mazzini was born at Genoa in 1805, and is conse-
quently now in his forty-ninth year. His father was a
medical man, and considered a clever practitioner at
Genoa. The future soldier was educated for the law
at the university of his native town, but having culti-
vated ideas of a liberal turn, and his whole heart
being turned to the regeneration of his native country,
he became obnoxious to the authorities, and before com-
pleting his studies, was arrested on suspicion of being
closely connected with Carbonari, during the revolution,
and upon his accounts failing to prove his charges,
Mazzini was shipped off into banishment. The soul of
this noble-spirited man was not, however, so easily sub-
dominated. Devoted to republican principles, and resolved
to achieve the independence of Italy, he founded an Italian
journal at Marseille, and circulated it from thence
throughout his native land. The trials of Louis Philippe
could not break the endowment of free sentiments, and orders
were sent from Paris to arrest Mazzini and turn him out of the country.

Mazzini continued to correspond with the
liberals of his native country, and with them consulted
on the best plan of removing it from the abyss of degra-
dation. But an overwhelming strain remains upon the
continued hospitality and the bountied integrity of
the English gentleman, by the peridious, mean, and dan-
cracious act perpetrated by the Home Secretary, Sir
James Graham; an act that should for ever have ba-
med him from the councils of a nation, and covered
his name with indelible disgrace. This traitor to the
rights of humanity—a prying sneak of the wily
Metternich—was base enough to open the letters of
Mazzini, and discover their contents to the Austrian
government.

Such a monstrous piece of treachery, sanctioned and ap-
proved of by the English government, caused the execution
of two noble-spirited young men, the brothers Man-
ders, who had condemned Mazzini upon the probable
success of a rising in the Roman and Neapolitan states:
they were arrested from Cieffe, conveyed to the Neapolitan
mountains, and shot. Mr. Duncombe, the liberal mem-
ber for Preston, and friend of Mazzini, brought the sub-
ject before Parliament. Sir James Graham, in the
Lower House, was unable to palliate the perfidy of his
countrymen, while old Aberdeen, in the House of Peers,
shimpered and whimpered over the accusation very pro-
perly and truly made—that the blood of the two Lan-
ders's rested on the head of the English govern-
ment.

The French revolution of 1830 broke out, and the
glorious cause of liberty resonated throughout Europe:
newspapers were belting in disguise, and a succession of
strangers—men of action, where he kept up the spirit and energy of
the Italian by his patriotic writings, which appeared
in a journal he there started. Illustrating thus wav-
ing and Italian interest, Charles Albert, vanity did he
try and persuade the people of his veracity and valid-
ity.
Fig. 7 Cartoon appearing in the French journal, *Le Petard*, November 11, 1877 illustrating the difference between French and English censorship laws.

Fig. 8 “Stuck in the Mud”, *Punch*, 1877.
THIS IS THE BOY WHO CALLED UP "NO POPPY!"—AND THEN RAN AWAY!!
Fig. 10 Cover of the 1860 Punch Almanac.
Fig. 11 James Redfield, Physiognomical System, S.R. Wells, New System of Physiognomy, 1866. This image goes so far as to divide the face into minute sections, each of which is indicative of a certain personality trait or emotion.
RESOLUTION.

Having endeavoured to separate this quality from all that is unworthy of it, but one view can be given of it under the present head.

The eyes, here represented as full, open, and expressive, without being staring.

The eyebrows especially marked and distinct.

The nose partaking of the Roman character, and equally firm and determined.

The mouth tight and compressed, with the same decision of character.

The forehead full, but receding.

An elevation of the head, as though drawn up for some occasion.

The muscles, an angular and sharp tendency, and marked out as it were for straightforward and determined action.

The muscles of the neck and throat sympathizing with the expression of the whole; the frontal swelling being very conspicuous.

A total absence of selfishness in the expression, with a slightness andparing of feature, as though made up for attack or defence.

CUNNING.

In the class of expression in which this head of Cunning is included, it is to be observed that

The great peculiarity is in the eye.

Very much the form of children's eyes; if we can imagine them brought into maturity, Morally accounted for—never learning wisdom, they retain their original unspeculative form.

The eyes a great tendency to fly upwards from the corners; the eye-brows having the same inclination, giving their expression a kind of hearing satisfaction.

The nose rounded at bottom, somewhat contracted at top; uniting in the same character, and seeming (as it were) under a good-natured constraint.

The month an irresistible smile, drawing all the confederate muscles together, as though to keep the secret.

One corner of the month having an especial inclination towards the eye; the greater confederacy lying between the two; and which mutual understanding, if put into words, would be, "Didn't we manage it nicely between us."

Fig. 12 "Resolution" and "Cunning", T. Woolnoth, The Study of the Human Face, 1865.
Fig. 13 James Redfield, "Comparison of an Irishman with a terrier dog", in *Comparative Physiognomy*, 1852.
THE FENIAN-PEST.

Hibernia. "O MY DEAR SISTER, WHAT ARE WE TO DO WITH THESE TROUBLESOME PEOPLE?"

Britannia. "TRY ISOLATION FIRST, MY DEAR, AND THEN——"

Fig. 14 "The Fenian-Pest", Punch, March 3, 1866.
Fig. 15 "The Irish Frankenstein", The Tomahawk, December 18, 1869.
THE IRISH FRANKENSTEIN.

"The beneficent and blood-stained Monster **, yet was it not my Master to the very extent that it was my Creature? ** Had I not breathed into my own spirit? * * * (Extract from the Works of G. B. HOUPLER, M.P.)

Fig. 16 "The Irish Frankenstein", Punch, May 20, 1882.
Mr. Doulton, a judicious member of the Metropolitan Board of Works, is reported to have prepared a capital suggestion for obtaining funds to defray the expenses of the embankment of the Thames, or any other similar improvement. It is that of establishing an octroi, or a sort of toll, on all provisions entering London. This would, it is said, be a very moderate impost, and yet would yield a large revenue, which could be applied to the purposes of the work. The details of the proposal are as follows:

1. An octroi would be established at the entrance to London, to be administered by a board of commissioners elected by the city and county of London.
2. All provisions, except those shipped in small quantities, would be subject to the impost.
3. The revenue derived from the impost would be applied to the expenses of the embankment work.
4. The cost of the commission and administration would be provided for by an additional charge on the provisions subject to the impost.

This scheme has the advantage of being simple, direct, and certain in its results. It avoids the evils of a system of licenses, which is considered burdensome and oppressive by the traders. It also provides for the proper distribution of the burden of taxation, by placing it upon the consumers of provisions. The revenue derived from the impost would be a valuable addition to the funds of the city, and would enable the authorities to carry out their important work with a minimum of cost to the ratepayers.
A VOICE FROM CAMBRIDGE

Here are Thermometers,
Here are Hygrometers,
Here are Barometers,
With all that is existant
In Quadrant or Sextant,
With all that is knowant,
All Dynamometers,
All Geometers.
Kew is inflected

Wide researches have been made,
Some on shore, and some in ocean;
The cost of instrument, a book.
Out of the funds of the Sandwichman.

A vessel, specially fitted out
To search for the purpose,
The British coast, all round it,
And the heavens a way,
Very specifically
Hydrographer.
Don't forget what I say.

A word or two about the progress
Of Science, sweet celestial órgues.

Monsieur Delaunay, the man of the moon,
Has made up his book, and will print soon.

The name of the great sky-scraper,
Glas€is, a name that names it
Through Europe, America, Africa, Asia;
And not on this globe alone.
But 'tis in the starry heights of heaven;
Ere he journeyed, round six or seven
English miles,
Above the house-tiles,
In mortal flesh and bone.

Chemistry thrives—
A man who drew
Into its dark est deposits
Seys he has blinded,
Heaven-befriended.
Carbon with hydrogen? (Oh, Gadooks!) And hence other compounds, more composite still,
Have answered the call of alchémical skill;
And he bids fair soon to see from mixtures
As only are found in organic fixtures.

(The President, uniformly dry,
Here grew thirsty and so did I.)

Why need we tell you how Mr. Scott Rus-

Tell,
Has been erecting his mental statue,
Gambauldi and the cause finding relations of form and force,
Between a model ship in a storm
And ways as high as huge Cairn storm?

Artillerymen, at Shoeburytines—
Have made away with—I should guess—
Fifteen thousand, more or less,
Proposities. Mr. Fairhavy knows;
But cannot very well dispute.

The International Exhibition
Shows the good of competition
In things of mechanical power;
There's a many locomotive engine,
Would run from London to Stonehenge in
Less than a solar hour.

And still the place
Grows better space—
A sash—a chair—some sweep
VWaterous feelings—
The brain is reeling—
And I'm—going to sleep.

Guilfald, 1862, Oct. 1st, 8 30 P.M.

This place is as hot
As a chimney-pot,
And some there is uttering, uttering—
What does he say?
We can't get away.

Verily that discourse wants buttering.

No less than twenty thousand pounds,
Five excellent savages, on glorious grounds,
We have lent or spent or given or lost,
To men of the stamp of old Zenard,
Who wasted their lives and ate their lives,
To find out why the lighting quivers,
And how the heat comes out of the sun,
To find out why the lightning quivers,
To men of the (tamp of old ZKDOSI,

And whence the wind it* anger draws,
And how the heat comes out of the sun,

To find, in short, some physical cause

Who waste their lives and eke their livers,

But cannot very well disclose.

In finding relations of force and form,

But in this, as in many other
Gorilla and the Negro is to be met with in some of the lowest dis­

example of any intermediate animal. But in this, as in many other
Gorilla theory very difficult

To observe the eclipse.

In a fleet of ship.

And not on this globs alone,

Barometers,

Here are Thermometers,
Here are Hygrometers,
Here are Barometers,
With all that is existant
In Quadrant or Sextant,
With all that is knowant,
All Dynamometers,
All Geometers.
Kew is inflected

Wide researches have been made,
Some on shore, and some in ocean;
The cost of instrument, a book.
Out of the funds of the Sandwichman.

A vessel, specially fitted out
To search for the purpose,
The British coast, all round it,
And the heavens a way,
Very specifically
Hydrographer.
Don't forget what I say.

A word or two about the progress
Of Science, sweet celestial órgues.

Monsieur Delaunay, the man of the moon,
Has made up his book, and will print soon.

The name of the great sky-scraper,
Glas€is, a name that names it
Through Europe, America, Africa, Asia;
And not on this globe alone.
But 'tis in the starry heights of heaven;
Ere he journeyed, round six or seven
English miles,
Above the house-tiles,
In mortal flesh and bone.

Yahoos have been lately collecting themselves in Hyde Park on a Sunday,
and molesting the people there assembled to express sympathy with
Garibaldi and the cause finding relations of form and force,
Between a model ship in a storm
And ways as high as huge Cairn storm?

Artillerymen, at Shoeburytines—
Have made away with—I should guess—
Fifteen thousand, more or less,
Proposities. Mr. Fairhavy knows;
But cannot very well dispute.

The International Exhibition
Shows the good of competition
In things of mechanical power;
There's a many locomotive engine,
Would run from London to Stonehenge in
Less than a solar hour.

And still the place
Grows better space—
A sash—a chair—some sweep
VWaterous feelings—
The brain is reeling—
And I'm—going to sleep.

Fig. 18 "The Missing Link", Punch, October 18, 1862.
AN AWKWARD FIX.

From the Springfield Journal, the President Elect's organ, we learn with a certain dismay that—

"Mr. LINCOLN intends immediately on the Chicago platform, and he will not, unless pressed to, not continue in any compromise that surrenders one iota of it."

This is an embarrassing attitude for any statement to take. If Mr. LINCOLN will not remove from the platform, which is the theme of Brother DURHAM and the platform into the Capitol together. It will be rather awkward, though, if the floor of the House is not large enough to take a senator openly to declare that his affection for a certain platform is so strong that nothing shall induce him to tear himself from it, it is quite a new locus standi, in the political world. The only possible compromise we see, when Mr. LINCOLN and his platform are carried to triumph to Washington, is, to get the latter unopposed instantly with the Board of Administration, and then ABRAHAM can "stump" away as much as she likes on both.

There can but little difficulty in this operation in a country where they move houses more easily than spiritualists move chairs or tables, than a Moxi, who is ordered a change of air, can be carried twenty miles in the country simply by giving his orders over-night, and without a single baby in the establishment being the least disturbed by the arrangement, or as much as a creditor being cognisant of the move. If it is so easy there to transport an entire house without spilling even a drop of ink, it cannot only require the power of a second Aladdin to carry a simple platform through the country, and to do it so steadily and effectively that Mr. LINCOLN, on his arrival at the White House, shall be as immovable as ever, having traversed the United States, without having least in the smallest way either to the north or the south.

Why are the Game Laws the jolliest laws we have? Because their express object is to "keep the game alive."

A CHEST PROTECTOR.—One of CHUBB'S locks.

Fig. 20 "The Italian Boot" and "Instead of Which and Not Only", Punch, March 2, 1861.
Fig. 21 French journals *Le Grelot*, June 23, 1872 and *Le Sifflet*, August 1, 1875 in response to the censorship laws published a description of the outlawed images and their messages.
A HINT TO LOUIS NAPOLEON.

"THE POPE HAS THREATENED TO EXCOMMUNICATE THE EMPEROR NAPOLEON."—French Paper.
KIDNAPPING.

Fig. 24 "Kidnapping", Punch, June 30, 1860.
Fig. 26 Garibaldi’s likeness on a matchbook cover. Milan: Civ. Raccolta delle Stampe.

Fig. 27 A Garibaldi-Christ. Bologna: Museo del Risorgimento.
Fig. 28 A blessing Garibaldi Christ.

Fig. 29 "The Cavalry of Garibaldi". Garibaldi on the cross (with a title overhead indicating the date and place of his war wound) surrounded by the primary players of Italian government. To the left, Pope Pius IX and Napoleon II "dance with joy."
Fig. 30 "In memory of the great men who made Italy"

Fig. 31 "Garibaldi in London," *The Illustrated London News*, April, 1864.
Fig. 32 "Garibaldi welcomed by the mayor of London at the train station," *The Illustrated London News*, April, 1864.

Fig. 33 "Garibaldi's arrival in Southampton," *The Illustrated London News*, April, 1864.
GARIBALDI THE LIBERATOR;

Or, The Modern Perseus.

Fig. 34 "Garibaldi the Liberator", Punch, June 16, 1860.
"THIS IS THE NOBLEST ROMAN OF THEM ALL!"

Fig. 35 "This is the Noblest Roman of Them All!", *Punch*, April 9, 1864.
FAREWELL TO GARIBALDI.

"IF WE DO MEET AGAIN, WE'LL SMILE INDEED;
IF NOT, 'TIS TRUE, THIS PARTING WAS WELL MADE."—SHAKESPEARE.

Fig. 36 "Farewell to Garibaldi", Punch, April 30, 1864.