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INTRODUCTION

The disintegrated Italian peninsula had been the scene of political unrest from the time of Napoleon's conquest in 1797; he came to them in the guise of friend and liberator only to throw upon them the French yoke. After the Napoleonic Wars, the European potentates gathered at the Congress of Vienna (1815) restored to the former States of the Church its temporal power. In reality, however, it had only substituted the French domination in Italy for that of despotic Austria which proved to be even more alien to the Italians than the rule of the former. The Pope was allowed to rule the Papal States, a stretch of land extending diagonally across the middle of Italy from Rome to the Adriatic. It had an area of about 16,000 square miles with a population of more than 3,000,000. To the north the Papal territory was bordered by Tuscany, Modena, Parma, Piedmont-Sardinia, Venetia, and Lombardy which belonged to Austria and were administered from Vienna; to the south, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies which was governed by a branch of the Spanish Bourbon family.

Italy, adjacent to republican France on the one hand and imperialistic Austria on the other, became subjected to the controlling influence first of one country, then of the other.
Opposition to the domination of a foreign power, as well as reaction to the suppression of liberties these powers engendered, was made the occasion of increased political activity on the part of secret societies, the most important of which was Mazzini's Young Italy. Thus at various times between 1820 and 1845, armed conflicts, sporadic and unsuccessful, had arisen, bringing the Austrian troops to the support of the Pope. In 1848, the year in which formal diplomatic relations between the United States and the Vatican were established, the Italian patriot, Mazzini, set up a temporary republic in Rome. Pope Pius IX, opposing the republic, fled to Mola di Gaeta in the dominions of Ferdinand of Naples. He returned to Rome in April 1850, and for the next twenty years French troops supplied by Emperor Napoleon III upheld the Pope's temporal sovereignty in the Papal States. Meanwhile the rest of Italy was united in an independent kingdom under Victor Emmanuel II.

After Prussia defeated France in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, French troops had to withdraw from Rome and the papal lands. All of Italy now became united under Victor Emmanuel. The Papal States were reduced to 108.7 acres in area with a population of 1,025. Pius IX refused to recognize the new order and remained a voluntary "prisoner of the Vatican" until his death eight years later. His example was followed by his successors until the signing of the Lateran Treaty in 1929. Just a short
time prior to the unification of Italy, the United States severed its diplomatic relations with the Papal Court, but many nations continued to send envoys to the Vatican throughout the entire period.

Apart from the above brief sketch of the Italians and their attempts at unification, their history forms an insignificant part of the thesis which follows. Various phases of the Italian problem are referred to where some special instruction had to be given to our American representative at the Vatican, but no attempt is made to analyze, to evaluate, or to explain the Italian situation.

In the course of the history of our country, the age-old question of separation of the church and state frequently rises under one form or another causing a tidal wave of national debate. To many of the people of the United States, as well as to many students of American history, the fact that we have had formal diplomatic relations with the Vatican State for a period of twenty years, 1848-1868, is unknown; and if it is known, their knowledge of the entire relationship is fragmentary. Therefore, it is my purpose to investigate this particular phase of American diplomatic relations regarding its origin, its scope, its personnel, its problems, its solutions, and its termination. Since the period in which the relations between the United States and the Vatican reached the height of their importance was the Civil War
era, this thesis will treat more in detail this particular period.
CHAPTER I

OPENING OF FORMAL DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE
UNITED STATES AND THE VATICAN

In 1784, the year following the signing of the Treaty of Paris which recognized and confirmed the independence of the United States, the papal nuncio at Paris wrote to the American peace commissioners who were still in that city, "that his government had agreed to open the ports of the States of the Church to the vessels of the new republic." No action was taken by the United States until March 14, 1797, when an astute Italian merchant, Giovanni Battista Sartori, wrote from Rome to Robert Morris, drawing his attention to the considerable and increasing trade between the United States and Italy, and to the fact that we had nobody in Rome to take care of these growing interests. He naively added that if Congress would approve he offered his best Service for this appointment in any place they would think proper. Only...that Rome is the principal place of Italy, and where resides every Minister or Agent for the other nations. I shall undertake this

1 Leo Francis Stock, ed., Consular Relations Between the United States and the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches, Washington, 1945, II, xxiii.
great satisfaction entirely for the honor of being employed in the American affairs as the Country I love....

On June 26, 1797, he was commissioned by the State Department as the Consul of the United States at Rome. He constituted the first of eleven consuls and was succeeded by another Italian resident, Felix Cicognani. In January, 1837, the first consul of American birth to represent the United States at Rome was appointed: George W. Greene of Rhode Island, grandson of Nathanael Greene of Revolutionary fame. From then on consuls served American interests in Rome until after the fall of the Papal States in 1870.

Relations would have probably remained on a consular basis had it not been for the accession to the Papal throne of a Pope who personified the Italian ideal of a liberal monarchial ruler—Pope Pius IX. His election in June 1846, was received by Italy and the entire world with a great deal of popular rejoicing; for in contrast to his predecessor, Gregory XVI, the new Pope was quite eager to make concessions to liberalism. Equipped with military experience and extensive travels, he immediately inaugurated liberal political and social reforms: he proclaimed a general amnesty in favor of all persons condemned for political offences; he diminished the severity of the censorship of the

press; he created a civic guard and promised the same to the provinces; he granted a constitution which provided for a bi-cameral legislative body with a lay element included; he undertook marked internal improvements; and above all, he favored greater national solidarity and opposed foreign domination. At the very outset, he showed opposition to the Austrian occupation and to their repressive policy. By the close of 1847, the liberal reforms of the Papal government had spread its influence to several other Italian governments.3

All these liberal concessions aroused universal enthusiasm which found repercussions in the United States. Many Americans living in Rome at this time expressed the hope that President Polk would send to the Holy See some distinguished representative.4 The American press almost unanimously recommended that we express our sympathy and admiration to the liberated Italians and their ecclesiastical monarch by sending a diplomatic representative to the Papal Court.5 Mr. Nicholas Browne, the

3 John Webb Probyn, Italy: From the Fall of Napoleon in 1815 to the Death of Victor Emmanuel in 1878, New York, 1884, 86-93.

4 The accepted rules of international law did not recognize consuls as forming a class of diplomatic agents. They were more or less necessary to care for the occasional interests of citizens of the respective governments, and to promote commerical relations between the two countries.

United States Consul to Rome, wrote to Secretary of State Buchanan that persons holding high official positions in the Papal Government had expressed a desire that diplomatic relations between the United States and the Papal Government be established "on a footing similar to those which exist between the Papal States & countries where the Romish Religion is not the prevalent sect" and that on the occasion of his first presentation to Pius IX, "His Holiness took the opportunity to express the same idea." 6

Thus upon the suggestion of James Buchanan, President Polk in his annual message to the Thirtieth Congress, First Session, included a recommendation for the opening of a diplomatic mission to Rome:

The Secretary of State has submitted an estimate to defray the expense of opening diplomatic relations with the Papal States. The interesting political events now in progress in these States, as well as a just regard to our commercial interests have in my opinion rendered such a measure highly expedient. 7

Although the statement occupied an inconspicuous place in the presidential message, being inserted between carrying into execution our treaties with the Sublime Porte, Tripoli, Tunis, Morocco, and Muscat and estimates for outfits and salaries of chargés d'...
affaires to the Republics of Bolivia, Guatemala, and Ecuador, it nevertheless was violently opposed by a few members of Congress causing a prolonged and bitter debate to ensue.

The Opposition in the House was led by Lewis C. Levin of Pennsylvania, one of the founders of the Native American party. In a lengthy speech which filled somewhat over nine columns of the Congressional Globe, he began his tirades against the embassy with the statement that he had been "so often misrepresented by the paid agents of the Jesuits who hang around this Hall, and who swarm over our land,..." He did not feel that an embassy to Rome could be called a national measure intended for public benefit since we had no commerce, no seamen, no navy "riding in her only harbor," nor were the political reforms of Pius IX worthy of any credit. The rational solution to this newly-awakened sympathy lay in the American ballot-box--to keep up the supply of foreign voters who were to be "judiciously located by the legate of the Pope." He charged those favoring the mission with being willing to jeopardize American honor and freedom for the sake of conciliating the foreign Catholic vote.

The bill now before the committee proposes to strengthen and fortify and extend Jesuit influence in the United States . . . Pass your bill, and from that hour Native Americanism means only the defense of Protestant rights and Protestant freedom against Papal tyranny and Jesuit aggression.8

8 Congressional Globe, 30th Cong., 1st Sess., March 8, 1848, 418-421.
His colleagues, Messrs. Charles J. Ingersoll and Charles Brown, both of Pennsylvania, strongly defended the Church and reproached Levin for having introduced "this incendiary subject"—the religious question. The federal Constitution as well as the state constitutions, both by their spirit and letter, prohibit the introduction of the religious subject into their "domestic or foreign relations in any way whatever." Henry W. Hilliard of Alabama, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, disagreed with Levin to such a point that he considered a chargé insufficient and recommended a resident minister; he did not mistake the Pope for a republican but considered him as a reformer. Other members of the House advocated that religious matters be left where the Constitution left them and that no mission be established which was not demanded by political or commercial considerations. However, the final vote taken in the House was favorable to the opening of diplomatic relations with the Papal States by sending a chargé d'affaires to Rome. The vote stood 137 ayes to 15 nays.9

In the Senate the religious phase of the question played a minor part in the not too bitter debate. On the whole the opposition was based on the opinion that the political and

9 Ibid., 445. All of the opposition voters were Whigs except Levin. Five of the fifteen were from Ohio, five from Massachusetts, two from Vermont, two from Pennsylvania, and one from New Jersey.
commercial needs of the situation could be adequately handled by the already established consulates. Levin's counterpart in the Senate was George E. Badger, who stressed the point that

the whole amount of the commercial intercourse of the United States with these States, does not amount to one hundred thousand dollars a year; and . . . so far as the commercial interests of the United States are concerned it would be paying the largest insurance that has been known in commercial dealings, if we incur the expense either of a full mission or a chargé ship for the purpose of affording some incidental benefit or protection to a commerce not exceeding one hundred thousand dollars a year, already under the charge of three American consuls. 10

Senator Thomas H. Benton of Missouri suggested to change the chargé d'affaires to minister plenipotentiary, but he was opposed by Senator Edward Hannegan who felt it would be "better policy" to substitute a minister resident rather than a full embassy. Since countries like Belgium, Portugal, Austria, and the other Italian States with whom the United States had extensive commercial relations only received a chargé, it was unnecessary to go beyond the grade of minister to the Papal States. He added, however, that the minister resident would have an advantage over a chargé as the former would have access to the sovereign directly while the latter would not. John C. Calhoun of South Carolina was not prompted by any partisan or religious consideration but recommended putting the mission on a temporary basis. He felt that the present political condition of affairs in

10 Ibid., 477.
the Italian States was in a state of revolution, and the Pope was the central moving power to control the movement; therefore, if violence broke out endangering American interests, we would be able through the help of the Pope to guard our commerce, protect our citizens, etc. As the reason was a temporary one, the mission should also be temporary. The final vote taken in the Senate was 36 to 7 in favor of establishing the diplomatic relations, with a chargé d'affaires as our representative.

On April 1, 1848, James Buchanan, Secretary of State, issued to Jacob L. Martin of North Carolina an appointment as chargé d'affaires near the government of the Papal States. His salary as fixed by law was $4,500 a year. Martin was instructed to keep one consideration constantly in mind while dealing with the Papal authorities: to distinguish between the Pope as the political sovereign of the Roman States and as the supreme pontiff of the Catholic Church. Although practically all the governments which had diplomatic representatives in Rome were connected with the Pope as head of the Catholic Church, the United States would occupy a different position in this respect—it possessed no

---


12 Globe, 520-521.

13 Martin had become a convert to the Catholic religion a few years before his commission of chargé while still secretary to the American Legation in Paris. He had become remarkable for his zeal and devotion. Feiertag, 36-37.
power whatever over the question of religion. Furthermore, he was to devote himself "exclusively to the cultivation of the most friendly civil relations with the Papal Government, and to the extension of the commerce between the two countries"; he was to avoid carefully, "even the appearance of interfering in ecclesiastical questions, whether these related to the United States or any other portion of the world." These views were to be made known to the Papal authorities as soon as possible so that there would be no misunderstanding on the subject. 14

Martin arrived in Rome on August 2, 1848, and was received by Pius IX on August 19 "with a high degree of cordiality." About three weeks after his arrival, August 26, he died, presumably of a stroke of apoplexy or of "Roman fever."

There was opposition in the Senate to the appointment of another chargé immediately after the death of Martin, the reason given was that the unsettled state of affairs in Italy did not warrant the sending of a diplomatic representative at this time. As early as May 1848, it was reported that a revolutionary government had been established in Rome, and the permanent extinction of the papacy was prophesied. 15 On November 24, 1848,

14 Leo Francis Stock, United States Ministers to the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches, 1848-1868, Washington 1933, I, 2. James Buchanan to Jacob L. Martin, April 5, 1848.

15 Feiertag, 42, quoting from New York Daily Tribune, October 21, 1848.
the Mazzinian revolutionary government was set up, and the Pope was forced to leave the Eternal City and flee for safety to the Bourbon kingdom in the South of Italy. Confusion and disorder prevailed in Rome. Pio Nono appealed to the Catholic nations, and Louis Napoleon, as yet bearing only the title of President and out of purely selfish motives, sent to Rome, in June 1849, the French military expedition which ousted the Mazzinian republic and reinstated Pope Pius IX. Meanwhile, although the outcome of the situation in Rome seemed doubtful, Major Lewis Cass, Jr., was appointed the new chargé on January 6, 1849.

During the anarchy which prevailed in the closing period of the republican regime, Cass was able to protect the lives and property not only of the American people but also that of other nations. On July 17, 1854, he was promoted to the rank of Minister Resident of the United States to the Papal States. This appointment, however, affected his diplomatic rank only, as the clause of the act of March 3, 1853, making appropriations for the civil and diplomatic expenses of the government, provided that ministers thus appointed "shall not receive more compensation than is now allowed to a chargé d'affaires."16

Cass soon found it necessary to complain that the salary allowed by the Department of State was insufficient for the maintenance of a diplomatic representative in the manner in which

16 Stock, Ministers, 100.
his office demanded. Only a person of independent means could continue serving the best interests of his country abroad on such a meager salary. Congress debated the issue, declaring that diplomatic posts were useless—"mere patronage in the gift of the executive." It was toward the end of his stay in Rome and through the efforts of Daniel Webster, who initiated a reform measure, that the salary was increased to $7,500.17

John P. Stockton replaced Cass in November, 1858. He left the United States on the eve of the Civil War and was faced with a similar state of affairs in Rome; another political revolt threatened the Papal States. Finding himself incapable of coping with the situation, he asked for his recall. Rufus King was appointed in April 1861, but Stockton was to remain at his post until the arrival of the new minister. Secretary of State Seward, in calling attention to the kindred political situation which existed simultaneously in Rome and in the United States, instructed King to assure

the Government of His Holiness that the President and the people of the United States desire to cultivate with it the most cordial and friendly relations; that we will not violate the friendship already so happily existing by an intervention in the domestic affairs of the States of the Church.18

On the other hand, the United States expected Rome to take the

17 Feiertag, 73-74.
18 Stock, Ministers, 238, Seward to King, April 29, 1861
same attitude toward our domestic situation.

We could not ask or consent to receive more, and the Government of His Holiness will not propose to do less, for he is a friend to peace, to good order, and to the cause of human nature, which is now, as it always has been, our cause. 19

As King had received permission to delay his departure from the United States, Seward instructed Stockton to communicate the contents of the despatch to the government of His Holiness "without delay." His Eminence the Secretary of State Cardinal Antonelli was able to receive the communication only privately, as Mr. King had to be officially received before any instructions to him could be noticed. Privately, however, Cardinal Antonelli expressed his views that it would be improper for the Catholics of the United States, as Catholics and as a church, to take part in the matter. As citizens he had no doubt that they would all feel great concern at their country's internal dissension. 20 The Cardinal reminded Stockton that the government of His Holiness concerned itself mainly in spiritual matters, but was a supporter of law and order everywhere.

When King was about to sail for Rome, the attack on Fort Sumter caused him to decline the appointment and to accept a commission in the federal army. He wrote to President Lincoln on

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid., 236, Stockton to Seward, September 14, 1861.
August 6, 1861, that he had accepted the appointment of Brigadier-General in the Volunteer Force and begged leave to tender his resignation of the office of Minister Resident at Rome. Lincoln accepted the resignation and appointed Alexander W. Randall to replace Stockton.

21 Ibid., 239, King to Lincoln, August 6, 1861.
CHAPTER II

THE CONFEDERACY AT THE VATICAN

The American Civil War occurred in an epoch when Europe was undergoing great changes. France had just acquired possessions along the Riviera; Spain had tried to recover Santo Domingo; Italy was gradually succeeding in her program of unification; the Poles staged a revolution in 1863; Denmark was overcome by Prussia in 1864; Maximilian of Austria went to Mexico in the interests of France. With Europe in such a military mood it was natural for both the north and the south to seek alliances or at least signs of good will. Since the South was endeavoring to change her status, it became incumbent upon her statesmen to justify her course of action and convince foreign powers that they could benefit by recognizing a new nation on the Gulf of Mexico. The hope of the Confederacy from its inception rested upon foreign recognition. Thus at the outbreak of the Civil War we find special commissioners of the South traveling throughout Europe seeking to interest the various nations in the southern cause.

It was not long before these special agents proposed to the Confederate cabinet the possible advantages to the Confederacy of enlisting the sympathies of the Holy Father, through whose
direct influence and that of his legates and hierarchy the attitude of the Catholic governments of France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Austria, and Bavaria, and the opinions of Catholics everywhere might be directed. Although the Pope had no military divisions to speak of, he still had at his disposal a formidable masse de manoeuvre on the diplomatic battlefield of the European continent. An even greater objective was that he might use his influence in preventing the enlistment of Catholic aliens, especially Irish and Germans, in northern armies, for the practice was very rapidly proving detrimental to the South.

James M. Mason, Confederate commissioner to Great Britain and the Continent, reported his conviction that illegal means were being used to lure Irish emigrants out of the country.22 Federal agents combed Ireland for able-bodied Irishmen; and in order to avoid the open violation of international law and the British Foreign Enlistment Act, the agents recruited the Irish as laborers rather than as soldiers. Once in America, however, the $500 bounty enticed many of them to join the army willingly, while many more were entrapped in military service.23 Judah Benjamin, Secretary of State of the Confederacy, took measures to


23 Frank Lawrence Owsley, King Cotton Diplomacy, Chicago, 1931, 517.
curb these enlistments by sending to Ireland agents of Irish
birth who would spread among the people such information as would
be likely to persuade them to the folly and injustice of volun-
teering their aid against the South. More than once the subject
was debated in the English Parliament but without avail. Pro-
tests were sent to Adams, the United States minister, who in turn
demanded specific proofs which were difficult to produce because
of the secret methods employed to obtain recruits.

The number of males who left Ireland and industrial
England was great. The Economist, January 5, 1864, reported that
30,000 Irish emigrated to America in 1861, 40,000 in 1862, 110,000
in 1863; and that of these approximately 100,000 had entered the
Federal army. 24

The causes for emigration, however, were not solely due
to enlistments. Although the Irish had been coming to the United
States for a long time, in the early years of the American Civil
War their emigration to the North was partly due to the poor
crops in Ireland during these years and partly to the withdrawal
of large tracts of land from cultivation to be used for pasturage.
The changing economic conditions in America were also a contri-
buting factor. The Irish laborer in the American factories,

24 Ibid., 518. These figures agree with the statement
made by Sir Robert Peel, Secretary of Ireland, who reported that
117,000 left Ireland in 1863, and 114,000 in 1864. Stock, CHR,
X, 14-15.
finding that his income was being reduced because of the cotton embargo, was unable to send money home to Ireland to support the members of his family left behind. Thus deprived of a livelihood by one means or another, the Irish eagerly sought foreign shores.

Regardless of the many motives for the emigration, the Catholic clergy of Ireland wrote to the Vatican protesting that the Federal government of America was "using up the Irish in the war like dogs"—cannon fodder for Grant's and Sherman's armies.25

In October 1862, the Pope wrote a pastoral letter26 to Archbishop Hughes of New York and Archbishop Odin of New Orleans exhorting them to exert their utmost effort to bring to an end the fatal civil strife and to restore peace and concord. The wide publication of the Pope's letter afforded President Davis of the Confederacy an opportunity to send a special commissioner to the Holy See. He addressed a communication27 to the Holy Father wherein he expressed the overwhelming emotion he experienced in reading the Pope's letter. He appointed A. Dudley Mann, a Confederate commissioner at Belgium, to act as his envoy and carry his message of thanks to the Pope personally.

Mann arrived in Rome on November 9, 1863. In the

26 See Appendix I.
27 See Appendix II.
course of an interview with Cardinal Antonelli, the latter expressed the earnest desire for the termination of hostilities and mentioned that the Holy See was prepared to do anything to bring about such results if it could be done with propriety. Mann immediately seized the opportunity to inform him that if it were not for the European recruits received by the North, the "Lincoln Administration" would long ago have been compelled "to have retired from the contest." Since most of these recruits were from Ireland,

Christianity had cause to weep at such a fiendish destruction of life as occurred from the beguiling of these people from their homes to take up arms against citizens who had never harmed or wronged them in the slightest degree. 28

The Cardinal Secretary arranged for an interview with the Pope on November 13, 1863. As the Pope was unable to understand the English language, Mann's son, Mr. W. Grayson Mann, translated President Davis' letter. His Holiness remained silent for some time after the letter was read. At length he asked whether President Davis or Mann were Catholics; Mann answered in the negative. The Pope then stated that since "Lincoln & Co." had endeavored to create an impression abroad that they were

fighting for the abolition of slavery, it might be judicious for the South to consent to gradual emancipation. Mann informed the pontiff that slavery was a southern domestic institution over which the government of the Confederate States, like that of the old United States, possessed no control whatever;

that all meliorations with regard to the institution must proceed from the States themselves, which were as sovereign in their character in this regard as were France, Austria, or any other Continental power; that true philanthropy shuddered at the thought of the liberation of the slave in the manner attempted . . . that such a procedure would be practically to convert the well-cared for civilized negro into a semibarbarian; that such of our slaves as had been captured or decoyed off by our enemy were in an incomparably worse condition than while they were in the service of their masters; that they wished to return to their old homes . . . if, indeed, African slavery were an evil, there was a power which in its own good time would doubtless remove that evil in a more gentle manner than that of causing the earth to be deluged with blood for its sudden overthrow.

Seeing that the Pope received these remarks with an approving expression, Mann proceeded to inform His Holiness that the South was not encountering armies of Northern birth, but that of European creation, chiefly those of Irish and German birth. These unfortunates were tempted by bounties amounting to as much as $700 and once they were in the service, they were invariably placed "in the most exposed points of danger in the battlefield"

29 Richardson, 593. The expression "Lincoln & Co." seems to have been coined by Pope Pius IX himself.

30 Ibid., 593.
... but for foreign recruits the North would most likely have broken down months ago "in the absurd attempt to overpower the South." His Holiness expressed his astonishment at such monstrous employment and promised to write to President Davis, "and of such character that it may be published for general perusal." With a few more kind, personal questions to Mann and his son, the interview ended. In closing the despatch to Benjamin which described the interview, Mann contrasted the striking majestic conduct of the government of the Pontifical State "with the sneaking subterfuges to which some of the Governments of western Europe had recourse in order to evade intercourse with our Commissioners."  

On December 8, 1863, the Cardinal Secretary of State transmitted the answer of the Pope to the President of the Confederacy; the document was in Latin as all Papal documents are.  
In it the neutrality of the Vatican seemed to be impartially maintained. On the merits of the conflict the Pontiff observed the most discreet silence, giving expression only to the sorrow with which the struggle afflicted him and adding the conventional wish that peace might soon be attained. The communication had been addressed to the "Illustrious and Honorable Sir, Jefferson

31 Ibid., 595. Mann to Benjamin, November 14, 1863.
32 See Appendix III.
Davis, President of the Confederate States of America." This was the first time that any foreign potentate had addressed the Confederate as President, and Mann was jubilant. He did not send the letter to Davis, but kept it until he could personally convey it to the President.

Mann returned to Paris and placed a copy of the Pope's missive before Mason and Slidell. After reading the letter, they felt that its early publication on this side of the Atlantic would be of paramount importance. Mann hesitated as to the propriety of publishing the contents before the President had become acquainted with it, but Slidell and Mason assured him that such publication was expedient. Mann sailed to London where several weeks later he wrote to Benjamin a glowing account of the effect of the Pope's letter as it affected intelligent British circles. They considered the recognition by the sovereign Pontiff as formal and complete; the influence it would exercise in behalf of the Southern cause was incalculable. His Holiness' earnest wishes would be interpreted as "imperative commands" by the vast portion of humanity who considered him as Christ's Vicar on earth.33

Mann's fervid enthusiasm regarding the letter was not shared by other Confederate agents whose correspondence failed to

33 Official Records, 1000. Mann to Benjamin, January, 1864.
attach any such significance to the entire affair. Judging by Benjamin's correspondence, it would seem that neither Davis nor he considered this action on the part of the Pope as an overwhelming victory.

Its best influences, we hope, will be felt ... in producing a check on the foreign enlistments made by the United States. As a recognition of the Confederate States we cannot attach to it the same value that you do, a mere inferential recognition, unconnected with political action, or the regular establishment of diplomatic relations, possessing none of the moral weight required for awakening the people of the United States from the delusion that these States still remain members of the old Union ... .

One expression in particular which the Pontiff used showed how far his letter departed from formal recognition which Mann had vainly imagined. His Holiness described the great conflict as a "fatal civil war." Such words depicted a conflict between contending factions of the same country. In terming it as such, the Pope had almost broken neutrality and aligned himself with the Union. As to the salutation, "President of the Confederate States," the Cabinet and the press considered it as a "formula of politeness to his correspondent, not a political recognition of a fact."

Nothing definite seemed to have come out of the entire affair as a diplomatic venture, although Mann wrote to Benjamin from Brussels, attributing the formidable demonstrations held in

34 Richardson, 623. Benjamin to Mann, February 1, 1864.
Ireland against the securing of immigrants for the United States as a result of the Pope's letter. Whether the Pope actually did something regarding the matter, it is difficult to say, for enlistments did not decrease, though they might have increased had he not intervened. "The call of the dollar, of free lands, and of high wages was too strong for even the good Catholic Irish to resist."35

Although the letter from His Holiness was not political in nature, his earnest desire for the restoration of peace, his readiness to do anything that could properly be done by him as head of the Catholic Church, and out of respect for his character and eminent position, the Confederate cabinet felt that a commissioner should be sent to reside near the court of the Vatican. Therefore, on April 4, 1864, Bishop Lynch of Charleston was appointed commissioner to represent the Confederacy near the States of the Church, together with full powers and letters of credence. Combining the advantages of eminent ecclesiastical and political qualities, his presence in Rome offered unusual opportunities of bringing him into contact with papal authorities and representatives of all the Catholic powers of Europe. Bishop Lynch was, indeed, well-suited for the position; for in addition to having his cathedral, residence, and the diocesan library destroyed by

35 Owsley, 526.
an accidental fire, General Sherman marched through his diocese to complete its devastation.36

Since the great powers of Europe had "unjustly hitherto declined to recognize the unimpeachable title of this Government to admission into the family of nations," it would scarcely be justified to expect the Vatican to be the first to recognize Southern independence. However, Lynch was instructed to keep in view the great advantage which would accrue to our cause by the formal recognition of this Government by the Supreme Pontiff and the establishment with him of the usual diplomatic intercourse. If an occasion be presented which . . . offers a reasonable prospect of the successful issue of such a step, the President expects that you will not fail to avail yourself of the opportunity. If . . . you become satisfied that the result would be unfavorable, you will content yourself with the maintenance of those informal relations which are usual the case of a Government not yet recognized.37

On his way to Rome, Lynch stopped at Paris where he paid his respects to the papal nuncio and had a long interview with the emperor and the foreign secretary. From there he proceeded to Rome where his mission ended in a complete failure. He had frequent interviews with Cardinal Antonelli and several audiences with the Pope, but his cause was given neither recognition nor encouragement. He was received at the Vatican only in his episcopal position, never as an accredited representative of

36 Benjamin J. Blied, Catholics and the Civil War, Wisconsin, 1945, 67.

37 Richardson, 471.
Although no official correspondence or despatches have been found between Bishop Lynch and the Confederate Cabinet regarding the former's mission to the Vatican, yet Rufus King wrote that Cardinal Antonelli informed him on occasion that the Bishop had never been received, or recognized in any way, as an accredited representative of Jefferson Davis, and that, like every other good Catholic, resident in the U. S., it was his bound duty to honor, respect and obey the constituted authorities of the Government, under whose protection he lived.

When the Confederate cause seemed hopeless, Lynch expressed his desire to return to his diocese. He applied to King, requesting the terms on which he would be readmitted to the United States. He was told to take an oath of allegiance and to make his peace with the Federal Government. Bishop Lynch was ready and willing to do so but feared that in America he would be proceeded against criminally. Upon the arrival in Europe of the President's Proclamation, he considered himself in the list of "exceptions." Writing to Secretary Seward, Lynch stated that he was not conscious of "ever having said or done anything to originate the war, to exacerbate it, or to prolong it an hour." He

38 Stock, CHR, X, 17-18.
39 Stock, Ministers, 341. King to William Hunter, June 2, 1865.
also told what he and his clergy had done to relieve the condition of the United States soldiers in prisons and hospitals. Through the added intercession of the hierarchy in the United States, he was permitted to return to Charleston on January 12, 1866, "effectually cured of his Secession folly."
CHAPTER III

THE UNION AT THE VATICAN

Shortly after James Mason and John Slidell, Confederate commissioners to England and France, succeeded in escaping the blockade from Charleston and were on their way to Havana and thence to Cuba, the administration at Washington decided to send special envoys to Europe to counteract the influence which they believed these two men would exert. Despite the fact that the United States had diplomatic agents throughout Europe, the administration wished to send eminent citizens who would be free from the restraints of official etiquette. They felt that envoys of this description might render valuable service by informing public opinion abroad, by mingling freely in society, by correcting popular misapprehensions, and by so working, prevent what men were beginning to fear—a war between United States and some of the great European powers.

On October 21, 1861, Secretary of State Seward invited Archbishop Hughes of New York, a personal friend of his, to come to Washington for a conference concerning grave public matters. The Archbishop proceeded immediately to Washington where in a
conference between the Cabinet and himself, it was proposed that
he accept a special mission abroad in connection with very impor-
tant national questions between the United States and certain
European countries. In a letter to Cardinal Barnabo, Prefect of
the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, Hughes gave an account of
what "passed between him and the cabinet."

I made known to the President that if I should come to
Europe, it would not be as a partisan of the North more
than of the South. . . . But, in fact, no one but my-
self, either North or South, knows the entire object of
my visit to Europe. . . . I made known to the ministers
in Washington that I could accept no official appoint-
ment from them; . . . that I could not undertake to
fulfill any written instructions, but that if I came I
should be left to my own discretion, to say and do what
would be most likely to accomplish good, or at least to
prevent evil. 41

Hughes was permitted to go with a carte blanche—to do and say
for the interests of the country, prevention of war, and interests
of humanity, anything that he considered proper. 42 The Arch-
bishop was old, wise, and influential with foreign-born Catholics.

41 John R. G. Hassard, Life of the Most Reverend John
Hughes, New York, 1866, 450.

42 John Bassett Moore, ed., A Digest of International
Law, Washington, 1906, IV, 446-447, quotes from Wharton's Inter-
national Law Digest, that "no letters to or from" Archbishop
Hughes or Bishop McIlvaine "are on file in the State Department,
nor is any record of their appointment to be found." The in-
structions given to Archbishop Hughes seem to be his only com-
mssion. He was to act as auxiliary to Mr. Dayton, American minis-
ter at Paris, and was to "extend his visit to any part of Europe
he might think proper, and to consider himself at liberty to stay
until recalled." Mr. Seward, Sec. of State, to his Grace Arch-
bishop Hughes, November 2, 1861.
in America; he had been a Whig in politics, and an intimate of Thurlow Weed and William Seward for a period of twenty years. This comradeship is quite discernible in the Autobiography of Weed, who affirms the instructions given personally by Secretary of State Seward to Archbishop Hughes.

Secretary Seward came on from Washington on the Sunday night train, and immediately after breakfast the Archbishop called upon him at the Astor House, ... to whom, with me, the Secretary read his instructions and then handed them to the Archbishop, with which he took his leave. 43

To preserve the balance between the Catholics and the Protestants, Lincoln appointed Charles P. McIlvaine, Episcopal Bishop of Ohio, and to these two were added Thurlow Weed and General W. Scott. Monaghan describing the group says, "Lincoln had sent to London and Paris two of the best American politicians, two of the best diplomats, and two of the highest-ranking theologians in America." 44

Upon his arrival in Europe, Hughes remained in France while Weed set off for London to meet with Bishop McIlvaine. In Paris he immediately began mingling in the distinguished groups of diplomats who invariably in their conversations reverted to him to explain the civil war between the two sections of the


44 Jay Monaghan, Diplomat in Carpet Slippers, New York, 1945, 176.
former United States. He very tactfully and skillfully explained everything as well as he was able, knowing that whatever he said would reach the ears of one or another of the ministers. At the Tuileries on December 27, 1861, he was graciously and kindly received by the emperor, Napoleon III, and the Empress Eugenie. The tariff and the blockade were discussed, and the Archbishop encouraged France to become independent of American cotton by raising the product in Algeria. Knowing the Empress to be Spanish by birth, he represented the South as planning to use Cuba for the promotion of slavery.45

Having become satisfied with the work he had accomplished in France, Hughes left for Rome in February, 1862. Here he received a cordial and flattering reception by the ecclesiastics of all ranks. It was here also that he heard of the censorious criticisms entertained by his episcopal brethren who felt that he had injured the cause of the Church of Rome by having accepted any commission from the government of the United States. The Archbishop explained the entire matter to the Holy Father, Cardinal Antonelli, and Barnabo, who not only approved of his conduct, but showed a disposition to "confer additional honors." Several months later, Randall, the United States minister to Rome alluded to this particular case in an audience with the Pope. The latter vindicated Hughes by expressing the pride that the

45 Blied, 84.
Church felt when at such a critical period the government of the United States placed "its frank, its full, its unreserved confidence" in Archbishop John Hughes by entrusting him with a most important mission.46

While at the Vatican, Hughes sought out the Spanish ambassador to advise him that any recognition of the would-be Southern republic would jeopardize the interests of her Catholic Majesty's colonies. Although Spain would not be ruined by such a recognition, she might, however, find herself in an extremely perplexing situation should by any turn of events the Southern portion of the United States be considered as an independent or separate nation. Hughes very subtly felt his way on this subject and became satisfied that Spain would, at least, keep out of any such absurd recognition.47

Hughes returned to the United States on August 12, 1863. The real purpose of his mission seemed to have been to mould public opinion against the recognition of the Confederacy. Just how much he actually accomplished can only be conjectured—not one of the countries he visited recognized the Confederacy. The administration at Washington, nevertheless, greatly evaluated the importance of his services. An official intimation was

47 Hassard, 472-473.
conveyed to the Holy See that the President, unable to offer Dr. Hughes a reward which he could accept, "would feel particular gratification in any honors which the Pope might have it in his power to confer upon him."48 Before such possible honors were conferred upon him, Archbishop Hughes died on January 3, 1864.

Shortly after Hughes left Rome, the new minister resident from the United States, Alexander W. Randall, arrived. Seward had informed him that Rome from its position and other circumstances commanded a vantage point for obtaining information regarding European affairs that were inaccessible elsewhere. He was urged not to lose time in transmitting his observations to the State Department. During his first interview with the Holy Father on June 6, 1862, Randall presented the character of our home difficulties and especially the course taken by the majority of Bishops and Priests of the Roman Church living in the United States. He referred to the American Catholic clergy with the hope that His Holiness would give some expression of their duty as citizens, especially the foreign-born citizens who were so easily misled. The hitherto rigidly maintained caution on the part of the Papal Court restrained the Pope from making any

48 Hassard, 485. Blied, 87, quoting from Robert Browne, Abraham Lincoln and the Men of His Time, Chicago, 1907, II, 430, mentions Lincoln as saying: "I intend to recommend in the most appropriate way I can that the Pope appoint Archbishop Hughes a cardinal, and so far interfere in the ecclesiastical affairs of the church."
positive statement on the subject.

Earlier in his mission, Randall expressed his unfittedness for the position. The formalities and ceremonies of the court were distasteful to him; he neither spoke nor understood Italian, French, or German; he was unacquainted with the history and politics of the European continent. He certainly felt that he was not the man to be stationed at the Vatican in Rome which was truly the crossroads of the world. He asked for a removal from his position and in August, 1862, he was succeeded by Richard M. Blatchford.

Blatchford found Rome in profound ecclesiastical and political anxieties: Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel were taking definite steps, and successfully, toward the unification of Italy. Seward instructed Blatchford to refrain from taking any part in the controversy, as the spiritual and ecclesiastical matters which entered into the struggle were completely out of his province. Secondly, since it concerned the Roman States, it was a domestic issue and we were a foreign nation. Considering the question politically, it was purely a European one and as an American representative he was bound to avoid all entangling connection with the politics of the Continent. Also, United States also attempted to maintain a discreet neutrality regarding the

49 Stock, Ministers, 259-260. Seward to Blatchford, September 27, 1862.
"civil war" of Italy.

During the course of the interview with the Pontiff on November 26, 1862, Blatchford informed Seward, that the Pope had indirectly offered to mediate between the North and the South. He began the subject by suggesting that mediation by some of the European Powers might be effectual, but this mediation to be accepted must be tendered by a power so unimportant as to irritate neither the pride nor the sensitiveness of the American Nation, some smaller country that has not interest in diminishing the Power of the United States, having neither army nor Navy, and whose very humbleness may make the offer of her services acceptable . . . he [Pope] had only a few battalions of soldiers and no Navy except a single corvette . . . .

Immediately after passing this remark, the Pope turned his attention to other matters without giving Blatchford time to make any comments. Just what was really intended by the Pope's statement does not seem to have been understood. Blatchford resigned early in October 1863, and Rufus King was given the appointment for the second time. King had organized the Iron Brigade and had served in the army until October 1863, when ill health caused him to resign. He suffered from epilepsy.

Rufus King arrived in Rome during the time that the Pope's letter to Davis was being paraded ostentatiously by the

---

50 Ibid., 262. Blatchford to Seward, November 29, 1862. In an interview with Rufus King, June 18, 1864, the Pope again indirectly referred to mediation by "some inferior power." King to Seward, June 22, 1864.
insurgents in Europe. High expectations were entertained of the benefits likely to be derived from it in favor of the Confederacy from the Catholics in America and throughout the world. At the earliest opportunity King sought out Cardinal Antonelli to confirm his beliefs regarding the Pope's letter. The Cardinal assured him that the letter to Davis was a simple act of courtesy and devoid of any political design or significance; and that if President Lincoln had written to the Holy Father on the same subject, the latter would have replied in the same tone and spirit . . . he [Pope] could not lean towards one, more than towards the other of the two parties into which at present the American People were, unhappily, divided . . . He sent a contribution to the Metropolitan Fair in New York, and would probably transmit a similar offering to the Confederate States; but always in the purpose of maintaining a strict neutrality.51

About a week later, Cardinal Antonelli informed Rufus King that several Southerners had expressed to him that the South equally with the North, favored the abolition of slavery, but thought that the slaves should be educated for freedom before being emancipated, otherwise, there might be risked a war of races. King repudiated the Southerners' statement with the remarks that no such pretence was set up at the outbreak of the rebellion nor

51 Ibid., 288. King to Seward, March 19, 1864. In an earlier despatch King mentioned the liberal donation made by Americans living in Rome, the Holy Father, and Cardinal Antonelli to the Metropolitan Fair which was held in New York to obtain funds for the U. S. Sanitary Commission. The work of the Commission was similar to the American Red Cross established later. The supplies for the Civil War were gathered principally through fairs held in different cities.
had any of the rebel leaders expressed such sentiments. The war had commenced and was still carried on "for the sole, avowed and indefensible object of extending and perpetuating the system of African bondage" on the part of the Southerners.52

At this time an incident occurred in Rome in which King found himself involved in an unprecedented, awkward position. The Archduke Maximilian of Austria with his wife, Charlotte and suite, arrived in Rome, April 18, 1864, to receive the parting benediction of the Holy Father before embarking for Mexico to become Emperor Maximilian of Mexico. On the following day, the Archduke was formally received by the Holy Father; and in the evening, the Diplomatic Corps, the Cardinals, the principal Roman nobility and many distinguished foreigners were invited to visit "their Majesties." Being well acquainted with his government's attitude toward the entire Mexican affair, the American minister was most embarrassed; while on the other hand, he felt that a false step might undo the success of his mission in thus far preventing recognition by the papal government of the Confederacy. In absence of any instructions on the situation from the State Department, and in view of the fact that this was an unofficial "visit of courtesy," King accepted the invitation. Seward, however, lost no time in setting King aright regarding such situations. In his despatch to him, King was instructed to discontinue...

52 Ibid., 289. King to Seward, March 26, 1864.
any official relations that might have been started with the Archduke at Rome; furthermore, he was not to have any formal relations with any foreign powers unless their governments had been acknowledged by the State Department of the United States. The Government of our country, Seward added, does not "hastily abandon old friends," nor does it "make haste to acknowledge new revolutionary powers." Without showing any offense to the Archduke, King was told to correct the public mind in Rome regarding "our true and unchanged position in regard to Mexico. . . ."53

In American circles both at home and abroad there had frequently arisen the question regarding the policy of the Court of Rome: Why was there no representative from the Papal Court accredited to the Government at Washington? The Cardinal Secretary, discussing the matter with King, remarked that the relations which Rome had with the various powers of the world were dictated from spiritual, rather than temporal considerations; religious questions, not political ones were the basis for official intercourse. Since in the United States alone there existed perfect freedom and equality in the matter of religion, there did not seem to be any need for such relations to be established. The Catholics were accorded every right and privilege enjoyed by any citizen, regardless of creed or conditions.54

53 Ibid., 293. Seward to King, May 16, 1864.
54 Ibid., 315. King to Seward, August 22, 1864.
The presence in the Vatican at this time of Bishop Lynch of Charleston made King seek a more definite expression of the American question. Cardinal Antonelli had made a thoughtful study of the American problem; he had read carefully the American Constitution; he had followed with discriminatory interest every phase of the Civil War. Thus informed, he expressed his convictions to Rufus King that the Confederate States had sought an unconstitutional remedy for their alleged wrongs; they were "endeavouring to dissolve by force a Union consecrated by law."55

The Court of Rome and the entire Catholic Church had always been opposed to slavery; however, he could foresee the danger and difficulty of emancipating immediately four million slaves. He felt that some desirable system of gradual emancipation of the slaves should be developed before any of them were given their complete freedom. The Papal policy was further stated in very definite terms on the occasion when His Holiness was informed by King of the latest intelligence from America: the encouraging indications that peace and union would be speedily restored. The Pope showed great gratification at the news and remarked significantly that "much as he deprecated the War and desired that it might cease, he could never, as a Christian and the head of the Catholic Church, lend any sanction or countenance, to the system

55 Ibid.
of African Slavery."56

The question may present itself, "Why had not the Papal Government voiced its precise stand on the slavery question during the early stages of the American Civil War?" The statements made by the Pope and Cardinal Antonelli near the end of the war were certainly not influenced by any turn of affairs the War took; they were unalterable principles of the teaching of the Catholic Church. An early expression of policy may or may not have influenced subsequent events, but it would have eliminated the suspicions aroused in diplomatic circles that the Vatican was engaged in a diplomatic strategem by throwing its lot in with the victorious faction. A plausible explanation of this assumption can be found in the policy of the Catholic Church which from its inception has been to exercise an infinite amount of caution, patience, and delay in scrutinizing any problematic spiritual situation. Faced as she was, and still is at times, with political problems due to her universal character, she no doubt carried out the same policy of deliberate delay in expressing any definite opinions until the question had been studied from various points of view. Thus when the South sought recognition at the Vatican and the North did everything to thwart recognition, the Papal Court maintained a strict neutrality until the entire question had been

56 Ibid., 321. King to Seward, October 25, 1864.
thoroughly analyzed and investigated. Having weighed the matter carefully, she was then able to express her opinion in clear-cut statements.

In the midst of the great northern victories which were rapidly being diffused abroad, the sudden and appalling intelligence reached Rome, April 27, 1865, of the assassination of President Lincoln and the attempt upon the lives of the Secretary of State Seward and his Assistant. Profound and universal expressions of horror and indignation were uttered the length and breadth of Europe among men of every class, creed, and nation.

Out of this tragedy grew the case of Surratt, which became another item in the story of the relations between the United States and the Papacy. On April 21, 1866, Rufus King was visited by a private in the Papal Zouaves who gave his name as H. B. Ste. Marie and claimed to be a Canadian by birth. The purpose of his visit was to inform King that John S. Surratt,57 charged with complicity in the murder of President Lincoln, had recently enlisted in the Papal Zouaves as "John Watson" and was stationed at

57 John S. Surratt, son of Mary E. Surratt, was one of the conspirators organized by John Wilkes Booth to seize President Lincoln and take him to Richmond and thus end the war. The seizure was to take place on March 20, 1865, while Lincoln was driving near the Soldiers' Home in Washington. Their plans were frustrated by Lincoln's failure to appear. Learning that their plot was suspected, they all dispersed, Surratt escaping to Canada, then to England, and finally to Rome. He was outside the United States when the actual assassination of Lincoln by Booth took place. However, a reward was offered by the American Government for his return to the United States.
Sezze, some forty miles from Rome. The informant claimed to know Surratt well as he had made his personal acquaintance near Balti-
more a year before the assassination of Lincoln. Ste. Marie re-
peated to King, Surratt's confession of complicity in the murder of President Lincoln and the admission of his mother's guilty participation in the same plot.  

By August 1866, King, having assured himself that Surratt answered the descriptions sent to him by the State Depart-
ment, asked Cardinal Antonelli whether His Holiness would be willing, "in the absence of an extradition treaty," to deliver John Surratt to the United States Department of State upon the presentation of an authentic indictment. If not, would His Holiness be willing to enter into an extradition treaty which would make the surrender of Surratt possible. King further requested that neither Ste. Marie nor Surratt be discharged from the guards until more definite information concerning them was received from the United States. The Cardinal replied that there was no extra-
dition treaty between the two countries and that it was contrary to the spirit of the Papal Government to surrender a criminal where capital punishment was likely to follow; however,

---

58 Stock, Ministers, 367. King to Seward, June 23, 1866.
for the surrender of Surratt, would be granted.59
Regarding the holding of the two men, the Cardinal promised to
advise the Minister of War to that effect.
The Papal authorities had arrested Surratt before any
formal request to that effect had been made by the American
Government. The arrest was made with the approval of His Holi-
ness and in anticipation of a formal request from the States.
Unfortunately, on his way back to Rome, Surratt escaped from a
guard of six men into the Kingdom of Italy; he had made a diffi-
cult escape by jumping more than a hundred feet into a deep
ravine which surrounded the prison. The Italian authorities,
however, refused to co-operate with the United States in his cap-
ture; but some time later he was recaptured at Alexandria, placed
on board the U. S. Corvette Swatara, and returned to the United
States for trial in December 1866.

59 Ibid., 386. King to Seward, November 2, 1866.
CHAPTER IV

THE CLOSING OF THE AMERICAN LEGATION IN ROME

During the early part of January 1867, the American press releases carried information from Europe that the Papal authorities had interdicted the services of the Scotch Protestant chapel in Rome. It was also rumored that the American Chapel had been removed by the direction of the same authorities to outside the walls of Rome and that the American minister had complied with the arrangements and had hired a villa where the services were henceforth to be held. The topic was made the occasion of a debate in Congress where on January 24, Representative William H. Dodge of New York, submitted a resolution whereby the President was requested to communicate any information he possessed referring to the removal of the "Protestant Church or Religious assembly meeting at the American Embassy at the City of Rome, by the order of that Government." The motion was carried.

This was very definitely a rumor, and strangely enough, Congress acted on the rumor. What actually was the situ-

60 Feiertag, 149.
ation in Rome regarding the Protestant Churches can be briefly explained here. According to International Law,

The liberty of worship is very generally conceded to foreign legations in countries which maintain a religious establishment different from that of the diplomatic agent's country. If any diplomatic agent should assert the right of worship, within his legation, for himself and those of his fellow-countrymen who profess the same faith as he does, he would be upheld, within the limits of the like privilege conceded in the country of his sojourn to their foreign legations.61

The laws of Rome do not tolerate any other form of public religious worship other than such as conform to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church; but the right of any foreign Minister at the Papal Court to hold religious services under his own roof and in accordance with the forms of his national, or individual faith, was never questioned or interfered with.

The English who annually flocked to Rome in great numbers held religious services, according to the forms of their National Church, in a large building just outside the Porta del Popolo. They had never been interfered with by the papal authorities. However, a group of Scotch Presbyterians had been holding services in Rome for some time in private houses within the walls of Rome. Soon a second Scotch Presbyterian congregation was formed. No notice of the transgression was taken until the Duke of Argyll posted a public announcement of services to be held in the Scotch Presbyterian Church. An Anglican visitor to

61 Moore, 555.
Rome called the attention of the Cardinal Vicar to the matter by expressing surprise that the Pope should grant to the Scotch Presbyterians a privilege which was denied to members of the English State Church. The British consul, Mr. Severn, was informed of the Scottish minister's infringement of the Roman law, who in turn admonished the minister to discontinue the practice which would subject them to exile from the Roman territory, "or to arrest by order of the Court of Inquisition,--the tribunal vested with authority to take cognizance of offences of this description." The Scotch Presbyterians yielded and transferred their churches outside the city opposite to the one occupied by the English Protestants.

Meanwhile, during the winter of 1865-1866, the American Protestants met for religious worship at the residence of the American Minister in the Salviati Palace. Because of the crowds and Protestant worship, the Duke declined to renew the lease to the Minister's Apartments except upon the express condition that there would be no chapel connected with the apartments. Under these circumstances, the Protestant ministers of the Congregation of Grace Church furnished rooms in the Vicolo D'Alibert within the city of Rome where unopposed by papal authorities they assembled for public worship. Rufus King, fearful that the American

62 Feiertag, 148.
Chapel would be closed as was the Scotch places of worship, took measures to prevent such action on the part of the Court of Rome. He had the Arms of the American Legation placed over the building housing the American Chapel. This action seemed to have satisfied the requirements of the authorities for they permitted the American Protestants to worship without interference.63

This, then, was the actual state of affairs in Rome. It was unknown to the House of Representatives who on January 29, 1867, had under consideration the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.64 The clerk read the clause listing the countries that had our envoys extraordinary, ministers, and commissioners to foreign countries and had proceeded as far as "Rome" when the five minute rule for the remainder of the debate was adopted. Mr. Williams, who initiated the debate which was to end in the closing of the American Legation at Rome, could see no "sufficient reason" for continuing diplomatic relations with a "foreign hierarchy." He mentioned that the last information received from Rome, "although it does not come in an official form," had to do with the removal of the American Protestant Church outside of Rome. All the affairs with the Papal Government appeared to involve matters of a religious or spiritual nature; he therefore

63 Stock, Ministers, 415. King to Seward, February 18 1867.

64 Globe, 39th Congress, 1st Session, 850.
requested the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, to give reasons, political or economic, for the maintenance of a minister at the Papal Court. Mr. Stevens, grateful for the opportunity offered him, had been himself contemplating to move an amendment to strike out the word "Rome" and in its place to insert the following:

Whereas it is beneath the dignity and contrary to justice that this nation should be represented at any Court or Government which prohibits free worship by American citizens within its jurisdiction of the Christian religion; and whereas the Roman Government has lately ordered the American churches to be removed outside of the city and prohibited the free exercise by them of the Christian religion therein: Therefore no money hereby appropriated shall be paid for the support of the United States legation of Rome or for the future expense of "such legation." 65

Stevens' amendment had been premeditated, for he had ready a slip of paper on which was copied the above statement, and he immediately sent it to the chair with the request for its insertion.

In the debate which followed, Mr. Chandler ably defended the mission by arguing that the same should be applied to the Court of Constantinople and the Court of Spain where the "tyrannical exercise of power by the Mussulmann toward the Christian" was as just a basis for legislation as the one now under consideration. The rule, he further added, had been in existence in Rome for centuries and was recognized by us at the time the mission to that Court had been established. Therefore, the

---

65 Ibid., 850.
reason, good or bad, for which the Catholic hierarchy excluded Protestant churches from its walls should not be made a point of debate in Congress as it was an "established principle of the Roman hierarchy that the ritual of its establishment must be exclusive . . . ."

and though myself a Protestant, I cannot as a member of this Government, representing a Catholic constituency, under the toleration principle of our Constitution, consent to this bold attack, upon an established religion, equally Christian with our own . . . . I protest against inaugurating this petty cause of discord between the head of the papal church and the Government of the United States.66

Since no official information was in possession of the House that would justify the closing of the mission, Mr. Banks urged the members to pass the matter over until the time that such information would be received. It was made known then that the State Department had received communication on the subject and had referred it to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. When the communication had been read, however, it was found to contain no pertinent information, only an additional newspaper report that the American Minister had consented to the removal. Thereupon Mr. Hale amended the amendment by striking out Stevens' preamble down to and including the word "therefore" and instead to insert the words "provided that." The vote taken on the amendment was 67

66 Ibid., 850.
The following day Mr. Dodge presented what he considered relevant communications regarding the action of the Papal Government. The author of the communication was Dr. S. Irenaeus Prime, a Presbyterian minister spending the winter in Rome. Since he found the Scotch Presbyterian chapel more congenial than the American Protestant Church and had spent more time there, he was naturally personally aggrieved by the order given to the Scotch. He had written an account of the event to the newspapers; and before it was widely publicized, he had forwarded letters to Hon. William E. Dodge to be used in Congress. Besides stating that the Scotch were ordered to desist from public worship in the Papal dominions, he also brought out the fact that Mr. Odo Russell, acting representative of the British Government, mentioned to Cardinal Antonelli that the Americans had a place of worship outside the latter's legation. To this the Cardinal was supposed to have answered that "the Government would attend to that also."68

A new amendment was submitted by Mr. Hale: "No money hereby or otherwise appropriated shall be paid for the support of the American legation at Rome." Mr. Stevens changed it to "any legation at Rome." Mr. Banks again reminded the House of the

fact that the letters related to the position of the Englishmen at Rome and not to that of American citizens; and if diplomatic relations were to be completely severed, definite facts should be at hand in order to justify our actions. Although information regarding the American Protestant chapel had been immediately asked for, none so far had been received. Mr. Finch, therefore, felt that the best course of action to take, the one most consistent with the dignity of the Government and the American people, was to wait until official information about the action of the Roman government be received from our minister at Rome.

A pointed and relevant fact which would bear further investigation should be mentioned at this point in connection with the action taken by Rufus King as soon as he found out that the report about the American Chapel being closed by order of Papal authority was gaining credence in America. He immediately sent a despatch to the Department of State denying the truth of the assertions, and then sent a cablegram to the same effect. They were communicated to Congress by Secretary of State Seward before the close of the session, but neither the despatch nor the cablegram found its way to the press.69

Mr. Williams, who by now realized that his original purpose for moving the amendment had been lost in the ensuing

69 Feiertag, 165.
debate, reiterated the reason for which he felt the mission should be terminated: he could never understand the reason for this mission since the Papal Government was politically insignificant.

There might have been some ground for it when the Pope exercised temporal jurisdiction over all of the Roman States, but he has not any such jurisdiction now, but a "sealed up," as I believe he is, in the city of Rome by the kingdom of Italy and if he is confined to the city of Rome our relations are now purely spiritual and not diplomatic; not political, unless intended for the benefit of a particular church and a particular party. . . . 70

Shortly after the vote was taken with 51 ayes and 48 nayes in favor of closing the American Legation at Rome. 71

King was informed that on February 28, 1867, Congress enacted a law which declared that from and after June 30, 1867, no more money would be paid the Legation at Rome. This law left the mission still existing, but without compensation. 72 King was told to prepare to withdraw from the Capital, to leave the archives with the consul, and to take the proper vouchers for them, but no definite instructions were given him as to what explanation to give the Cardinal Secretary or the Pope. The situation was most embarrassing for King; since, if he were asked the reason for closing the legation, he would have to tell them that

70 Globe, 883.
71 Ibid.
72 Stock, Ministers, 426. Seward to King, April 20, 1867.
Congress acted under the belief that the American Protestant worship had been excluded from Rome; "the truth being, that it has not been interfered with, in any way."

On the contrary, we have been allowed, all the past season, to hold our services apart from the residence of the Minister. . . . that if our Minister is withdrawn, American Protestants will be obliged to go outside the walls of Rome to exercise religious worship and that they will owe this exclusion, not to the Pope, but to the action of their own Congress.73

King remained at his post until August 1867, for he felt that Congress, having been misled "by an utterly false report" would avail itself of an early opportunity to revise the proceeding. However, Congress failed to do so, and King on January 1, 1868, wrote to President Johnson of the United States tendering his resignation. The resignation was accepted by the President on May 25, 1868.

Conclusion

It was certainly a very undignified ending given to this particular phase of American diplomacy. That Congress should have taken official action on an unfounded rumor is rather difficult to concede. Since such action was wholly unprecedented in the history of the diplomatic relations of the United States, it becomes evident that there were other more ponderous motives which

73 Ibid., 427. King to Seward, May 7, 1867.
prompted its action. From the reading of the congressional debates, one is convinced that the religious motive did play a part, but a minor one. However, the more plausible motive at which one arrives through implication and which probably outstripped all others, may be found in the domestic political situation of that day; namely, the open hostilities which existed between the radical Republicans in Congress and President Johnson and his Secretary of State Seward. Thaddeus Stevens, who led the opposition in the House against Johnson and Seward, also led the opposition against the continuance of the Legation at Rome. In opposing the legation, he found vengeance for two of his strongest hates: the Catholic Church and President Johnson and Secretary of State Seward. He knew that the President and Seward were most favorably disposed toward the legation at Rome.

Another motive worthy of consideration lay in the great sympathy which the American people never failed to elicit for the Italian people and their struggle for unification. The closing of the American Legation at Rome could be interpreted as an anticipatory measure for the completion of the unification of Italy. When this would have been accomplished, the path would already have been cleared for the recognition of the right and title of Victor Emmanuel to the whole of Italy.

No motive for the termination of the mission could possibly have been derived from any action on the part of the Pope
or the Papal Government. All the American official representatives found intercourse with the Papal authorities agreeable and cordial, and all declared the papal government to be very favorably disposed toward the United States. The Pope, on his part, had frequently expressed his satisfaction with the official relations existing between the two governments. Small wonder then that King was given to understand that His Holiness felt hurt "by the hasty and apparently groundless action of Congress," and thought it "an unkind and ungenerous return for the good will" which he had always manifested towards the American Government and its people.

Thus for a period of about twenty years, the United States maintained formal diplomatic relations with the Vatican. In the early years of this relationship no great commercial benefits or political controversies took place between the two countries; the mission had been merely a gesture of good will towards the Catholics of this country. During the Civil War it served as a "listening post" to both the North and the South. Both sections of our country realized that at the Vatican would be found multiple opportunities for influencing foreign powers as these powers sent diplomatic representatives to reside near the Holy See. Each in turn attempted to place on the statements made by the Pope or his representative a political significance which was frequently more in harmony with their views than with those actually held by His Holiness.
APPENDIX I

PASTORAL LETTER OF POPE PIUS IX TO THE ARCHBISHOPS OF NEW YORK AND NEW ORLEANS

OCTOBER, 1862

Venerable Brother, Health and Apostolic Benediction:

Amongst the various and most oppressive cares which weigh on us in those turbulent and perilous times, we are greatly afflicted by the truly lamentable state in which Christian people of the United States of America are placed by the destructive civil war broken out amongst them.

For, Venerable Brother, we cannot but be overwhelmed with the deepest sorrow whilst we recapitulate, with paternal feelings, the slaughter, ruin, destruction, devastation, and the other innumerable and ever-to-be deplored calamities by which the people themselves are most miserably harassed and dilacerated. Hence, we have not ceased to offer up, in the humility of our hearts, our most fervent prayers to God, that he would deliver them from so many and so great evils.

And, we are fully assured that you also, Venerable Brother, pray and implore, without ceasing, the Lord of Mercies to grant solid peace and prosperity to that country. But since we, by virtue of the office of Apostolic ministry, embrace with the deepest sentiments of charity, all the nations of the Christian world, and, though unworthy, administer here on earth the vice-gerent work of Him who is the Author of Peace and the Lover of Charity, we cannot refrain from inculcating, again and again, in the minds of the people themselves, and their chief rulers, mutual charity and peace.

Wherefore, we write you this letter, in which we urge you, Venerable Brother, with all the force and earnestness of our mind, to exhort with your eminent piety and Episcopal zeal, your clergy and faithful, to offer up their prayers, and also apply all your study and exertion, with the people and their chief
rulers, to restore forthwith the desired tranquillity of peace by which the happiness of both the Christian and the civil republic is principally maintained. Wherefore, omit nothing you can undertake and accomplish, by your wisdom, authority, and exertion as far as compatible with the nature of the holy ministry, to conciliate the minds of the combatants, pacify, reconcile, and bring back the desired tranquillity and peace, by all those means that are most conducive to the best interest of the people.

Take every pain, besides, to cause the people and their chief rulers seriously to reflect on the grievous evils with which they are afflicted, and which are the result of civil war, the direst and most destructive and dismal of all the evils that could befall a people or nation.

Neither omit to admonish and exhort the people and their supreme rulers, even in our name, that with conciliated minds, they would embrace peace, and love each other with uninterrupted charity. For we are confident that they would comply with our paternal admonitions and hearken to our words the more willingly, as of themselves they plainly and clearly understand that we are influenced by no political reasons, no earthly considerations, but impelled solely by paternal charity, to exhort them to tranquillity and peace. And study with your surpassing wisdom, to persuade all that true prosperity, even in this life, is sought for in vain out of the true religion of Christ, and its salutary doctrines.

We have no hesitation, Venerable Brother, but, that calling to your aid the services and assistance, even of your associate bishops, you will abundantly satisfy these our wishes, and by your wise and prudent efforts bring a matter of such moment to a happy termination.

We wish, you, moreover, to be informed that we write in a similar manner this very day to our Venerable Brother John Mary, Archbishop of New Orleans, that counselling and conferring with you, he would direct all his thoughts and care most earnestly to accomplish the same object.

May God, rich in mercy, grant that these our most ardent desires be accomplished, and as soon as possible our heart may exult in the Lord over peace restored to the people...
APPENDIX II

PRESIDENT DAVIS' COMMUNICATION TO THE HOLY FATHER

Richmond, September 13, 1863.

Very Venerable Sovereign Pontiff

The letters which you have written to the clergy of New Orleans and New York have been communicated to me, and I have read with emotion the deep grief therein expressed for the ruin and devastation caused by the war which is now being waged by the United States against the States and the people which have selected me as their President, and your orders to your clergy to exhort the people to peace and charity.

I am deeply sensible to the Christian charity which has impelled you to this reiterated appeal to the clergy. It is for this reason that I feel it my duty to express personally, in the name of the Confederate States, our gratitude for such sentiment of Christian good feeling, and love, and to assure your Holiness that the people, threatened even on their own hearths with the most cruel oppression and terrible carnage, is desirous now as it has always been, to see the end of this impious war; that we have ever addressed prayers to Heaven for that issue which your Holiness now desires; that we desire none of our enemy's possessions, but that we fight merely to resist the devastation of our country and the shedding of our best blood, and to force them to let us live in peace under the protection of our own institutions, and under our laws, which not only insure to every one the enjoyment of his temporal rights, but also the free exercise of his religion. I pray your Holiness to accept, on the part of myself and the people of the Confederate States our sincere thanks for your efforts in favor of peace. May the Lord prolong the days of your Holiness, and keep you under his divine protection.
APPENDIX III

POPE PIUS IX'S ANSWER TO DAVIS' LETTER

December 11, 1863

Illustrious and Honorable Sir, Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States of America, Richmond.

Illustrious and Honorable Sir,

Greeting:

We have lately received with all kindness, as was meet, the gentlemen sent by your Excellency to present to us your letter dated on the 23rd of last September. We have received certainly no small pleasure in learning, both from these gentlemen and from your letter, the feeling of gratification and of very warm appreciation with which you, illustrious and honorable sir, were moved, when you first had knowledge of our letter written in October of the preceding year to the venerable brethren, John, Archbishop of New York, and John, Archbishop of New Orleans, in which we again and again urged and exhorted those venerable brethren that because of their exemplary piety and episcopal zeal, they should employ their most earnest effort in our name also, in order that the fatal civil war which had arisen in the States should end, and that the people of America might again enjoy mutual peace and concord, and love each other with mutual charity. And it has been very gratifying to us to recognize, illustrious and honorable sir, that you and your people are animated by the same desire for peace and tranquillity which we had so earnestly inculcated in our aforesaid letter to the venerable brethren above named. O, that the other people also of the States and their rulers, considering seriously and how deplorable is this intestine war, would receive and embrace the counsels of peace and tranquillity. We indeed shall not cease with most fervent prayers to beseech God, the Best and Highest, and to implore Him to pour out the spirit of Christian love and peace upon all the people of America, and to rescue them from the great calamities with which they are afflicted, and we also pray the same most

58
merciful Lord that He will illumine your Excellency with the light of his divine grace, and unite you with ourselves in perfect charity.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's, on the 3rd December, 1863, in the eighteenth year of our pontificate.
Source material for this particular phase of American diplomatic relations is scarce. Relations between the Vatican and the United States were obscured by the relations which existed between countries like France and England and the United States. Hence, in the more outstanding works of this period, authors tended to overlook or just mention casually papal relations. Secondly, up to very recent years, the Papal Archives have been inaccessible to the general public. Outside of these archives, it is doubtful whether there can be located the correspondence which passed between the papal secretariat and our ministers to Rome or the despatches sent by the papal consuls general in the United States to the Vatican. No doubt this correspondence would disclose information which would make the picture of our entire relations most complete. At present, we have only the correspondence of our representatives in Rome as found in the Department of State and the National Archives of the United States. From a thorough perusal of the documentary material in these archives, however, one can fill in the gaps and gather sufficient material to construct a comprehensive and almost detailed account of the relations.

I. PRIMARY MATERIAL

For a number of years, Leo Francis Stock made a study of the material available in the American archives on this particular phase of American diplomacy. His study yielded one of the most complete presentations of the subject in two volumes: United States Ministers to the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches, Washington, 1933, and Consular Relations Between the United States and the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches, Washington, 1945. The books are compilations of all the correspondence between our State Department and our ministers and consuls in Rome. Although the books contain the letters only, chronologically arranged, the preface to the volumes presents an excellent, overall story of the twenty years of diplomatic relations along with other significant American and Italian events. The Congressional Globe and the Appendix, Washington, 1848 and
1866, was the basis for much of the primary source material in Chapters I and IV of this thesis. The First Sessions of the Thirtieth and Thirty-ninth Congresses gave in detail the heated debates for the opening and closing of diplomatic relations with the Vatican. Noteworthy information regarding the opinions and attitudes of the country toward the Church of Rome was obtained from these debates. Surprisingly, the age-old question of the separation of the Church and the State did not enter the debates either in 1848 or in 1866. The Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949, Washington, 1950, contains interesting items about the political and professional life of the various Congressional members during this period.

Indispensable primary source material for the diplomacy of the Confederate States was found in Colonel Harry Kidder White, ed., Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies of the Rebellion, Series II, Vol. 3, Washington, 1922. This volume contains papers and records of informal personal accounts collected from private individuals as well as documentary papers salvaged from the Confederate State Department. The correspondence between the Confederate administration and their agents is copied exactly as the original papers have it, giving it a documentary twist, which is not the case in James Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Confederacy, Vol. II, Nashville, 1905. In the latter work, wherever the context would not be changed, Richardson corrected grammatical errors, completed abbreviations, and arranged material in a more orderly fashion.


Sister Loretta Clare Feiertag, American Opinion on the Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and the Papal States (1847-1867), Washington, 1933, supplied primary source material throughout her book by quoting extensively from the leading Northern and Southern newspapers through these years. Valuable items were obtained in James D. Richardson, comp., A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897,
Vol. IV, Nashville, 1900; and very pertinent facts in John Bassett Moore, *A Digest of International Law*, Vol. IV, Washington, 1906. In the last two books, however, just the pages relating to this particular period of American relations were used.

One of the two interesting books which supplied data for the introduction and various parts of the thesis on the history of the Italian people and their struggle for unification was John Webb Probyn, *Italy: 1815-1878*, New York, 1884. Written shortly after the death of Victor Emmanuel, it is a sympathetic account of an eyewitness who spent the years 1859-1871 in Italy among the Italians. The book is simple reading without the citing of any authorities for the statements made, although a bibliography at the end of the book lists French and Italian works. The other book, Pietro Orsi, *Cavour and the Making of Modern Italy, 1810-1861*, is more of a history of the nation than a biography. Frequent documentary quotations are given without listing the source. A brief, but useful insight into the lives and times of Pope Gregory XVI and Pope Pius IX was obtained in John Farrow, *Pageant of the Popes*, New York, 1942.

II. SECONDARY MATERIAL

A. BOOKS

In general, material found in secondary sources was thinly scattered throughout the books. One of the best, however, was Frank Lawrence Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy*, Chicago, 1931. The author felt that some of the authors of historical works tended to belittle the efforts of the South in regard to their diplomatic endeavors and that a deeper study of their attempts would reveal just as brilliant and energetic careers as those of the Northern diplomats. He spent two years in European archives collecting material dealing with Confederate diplomats and diplomacy. Chapter XVI of his book presents Mann's mission to Rome interestingly and thoroughly. Another book giving a fair account of Southerners was Burton J. Hendrick, *Statesmen of the Lost Cause*, New York, 1939. Jay Monaghan, *Diplomat in Carpet Slippers: Abraham Lincoln Deals with Foreign Affairs*, New York, 1945, dressed Southern diplomats in "Don Quixote" costumes, especially A. Dudley Mann.

Source material regarding the part played by Catholics throughout the country is mentioned in John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, Vol. IV, New York,
1892, and Benjamin J. Bled, Catholics and the Civil War, Wisconsin, 1945. A very prejudiced work by Judge Robert L. Rodgers, "Jeff" Davis and the Pope, Aurora, Missouri, 1925, was a vituperous, suspicious exposition of the correspondence between Davis and the Pope. Rodgers did not believe Davis wrote the letter to the Pope but that it was the work of some power "behind the throne," since the Roman Catholic Hierarchy dominated European Governments during the period of the Civil War. His statements lose ground when one considers the impossibility of such action and the various reliable sources in which the letter has been published—sources which never even question the fact that Davis is the real author of the letter.

A good presentation of the influence of the papal policy on European states—which was the main reason why the North and the South eagerly sought to win the support of the Papacy—is Lillian P. Wallace, The Papacy and European Diplomacy 1869-1878, New York, 1948.

General reference books which contributed very little towards source material to be used in the thesis itself, but contained helpful bibliographical references were in Chapters XXI-XXIII of Thomas Bailey, A Diplomatic History of the American People, New York, 1946; Edward Channing, History of the United States, Vol. VI, New York, 1917; and Arthur Charles Cole, The Irrepressible Conflict, 1850-1865, Vol. VII, New York, 1934. The volumes of Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone, ed., Dictionary of American Biography, New York, 1934, were valuable for their brief sketches of biographies of leading Americans of this period. The articles and biographical sketches of Herbermann, Pace, Pallien, ed., The Catholic Encyclopedia, New York, 1911, and Encyclopedia Britannica, Chicago, 1940, also provided useful material and additional leads.

B. ARTICLES

This was a period of history which Arthur Cole describes as an era "of extensive journalistic experimentation, in which worthy as well as shabby ventures often came to untimely ends." This lack of lasting periodicals as well as the fact that during the fifties there were no general weeklies of national importance, accounts for the lacuna in periodical literature relating to the subject of this thesis. Those periodicals which appeared near the end of the period reflected chiefly the economic, reform aspirations, or religious aspects of the American nation.

A great deal of credit must be given to the article by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., "Relations with the Vatican: Why Not?" The Atlantic, New Hampshire, January, 1952, not so much for the significant or revealing material, but for the fact that from the three or four sentences near the end of the article, the author of this thesis was inspired with a theme for her thesis: Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and the Vatican.
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