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I

INTRODUCTION

On June 17, 1866, Giovanni Mastai Ferretti, Bishop of Imola, was proclaimed Supreme Pontiff under the name of Pius IX. Called to guide the destiny of the Church at a critical time, he was unable to check the tide of events which finally swept away the last vestiges of the temporal power in 1871. Upon his accession to the pontifical throne, he embarked upon a series of reforms in the Papal dominions. Pius IX's liberalization of his government was, perhaps, more the result of necessity than of any conviction on his part of the merits of liberalism. After the repressive pontificate of Gregory XVI, reform, indeed, was a sine qua non. A month after his election, Pius granted an extensive political amnesty, and in the following year established a Council of State, culminating in the granting of a constitution on March 14, 1869. It was the news of these liberal reforms which stirred so much enthusiasm in America for Pius IX that even a senator hailed him as "the man of the age".

Pius IX was possessed of two outstanding traits of character: a kindly and benevolent spirit, and an insatiable
curiosity. All of the ministers of the United States to the Holy See concurred in attributing to him benevolence of heart and rectitude in his actions. Speaking of his first audience with the Holy Father, J. L. Martin, first chargé d'affaires of the United States to Rome, declared: "The interview was to me a very pleasant one, and impressed me vividly with that benevolence of character and gentleness of demeanour for which Pius IX is proverbial." On retiring from his mission, John P. Stockton, third minister of the United States to Rome, wrote to Seward, "Perhaps it is not improper for me in concluding my mission to say that I parted from his Holiness with a profound sense of the kindness and consideration I had always received from him, and with sentiments of the highest regard and esteem for his character." Cass in a despatch to Marcy, Secretary of State, alludes to Pius' curiosity: "Ever since the sailing of the Expedition to Japan, the Pope has manifested a very


2. Martin to Buchanan, Aug. 20, 1849, Leo F. Stock, United States Ministers to the Papal States (Hereafter cited as U. S. Ministers), pp. 5-15.

great interest in its progress. He has frequently
questioned me on the subject, and during the last twelve
months I do not think I have been admitted to an inter-
view with him, when he has not alluded to it." The Pope
expressed a desire for a copy of Perry's report and other
papers from the expedition. "His only motive, I believe,"
adds Cass, "is curiosity, or the interest so generally
felt regarding that strange and unknown portion of the
globe." 4

Lord Odo Russell, British diplomat, relates a
rather interesting story concerning Pius' "wonderful
ignorance of ordinary names and things." His Lordship
was conversing with the Pontiff on the Civil War in
America. The Pope declared, "J'ai écrit une lettre à
M. Davis, le Président du Sud, et j'ai aussi écrit à
l'autre monsieur, qui est le Président du Nord."
Russell mentioned that the name of "l'autre monsieur"
was Lincoln, His Holiness replying that he believed it
was. 5

Such was the judgement of Pius IX's contemporaries.

5. Leo F. Stock, "Catholic Participation in the
Diplomacy of the Southern Confederacy", Catholic
Historical Review, XVI, April, 1930, p. 17.
Later generations of historians have not altered this view of his fundamental character but have called into question his abilities as a leader. "As a simple priest, he would have left a happier record; his was not the stuff of which leaders of men are made."\(^6\)

The real power behind the Papal throne was the secretary of state, Cardinal Antonelli.\(^7\) Observers of his day and later historians agree that he was a statesman of consummate ability. It was largely due to his skill as a diplomat that the temporal power survived as long as it did. It is a tribute to his character that he remained in the position of secretary of state from the time of the Pope's flight to Gaeta in 1849 to his own death in 1876. He understood the character of the Pope and knew exactly how to obtain what he wanted. He was ambitious and unscrupulous in his methods of attaining his ends. Upon the Pope's restoration in 1849, he violated the conditions of surrender by imprisoning Liberals. He is reputed to have fomented brigandage on the Neapolitan frontier in order to effect a Bourbon restoration.

---


7. Although created cardinal by Pope Pius IX in 1847, Antonelli was never ordained a priest for reasons of his own. R. de Cesare gives an interesting description of him, pp. 124-127.
"Antonelli", declared the Confederate envoy, Mann, "is emphatically the State. He is perhaps the very best informed statesman of his time... His worst enemies accord to him abilities of the very highest order. They say that he is utterly unscrupulous as to the means which he employs, but that no other man could have saved the temporal power of the Pope. He is bold, courageous, resolute."

"The enemies of Antonelli", asserted Stockton, "would be willing for the Pope to leave Rome I think as they have no other hope of his separation from the Secretary of State. But while there are many to attack, find fault, and embarrass his policy, there is not one fit to take his place."

Richard M. Blatchford, fifth minister-resident of the United States at the Holy See, summed up well in the following words the outstanding qualities of the two leaders: "Everybody is ready to ascribe to The Pope benevolence of heart and rectitude in all he says and does—his popularity is great, and is equalled only by

---

8. No. 69, Mann to Benjamin, Nov. 21, 1863, Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion, pp. 963-964.

the admitted ability and statesmanship of the Cardinal Antonelli. 10

Such were the men who guided the destinies of the Holy See during the middle years of the nineteenth century, and with whom the diplomatic representatives of the United States had to deal. The popularity of Pope Pius IX, due to the inauguration of his liberal reforms, was an important factor in bringing about the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Papal States.

10. Blatchford to Seward, March 7, 1865, Ibid., p. 273. Seward's opinion of Antonelli was no less high. "I think," he states, "there is an universal acknowledgement of the great abilities, the consummate skill, and the inflexible firmness with which he (Antonelli) has hitherto conducted an administration encountering difficulties that, speculatively regarded, seemed unsurmountable." No. 15, Seward to Blatchford, Mar. 30, 1865, Ibid., p. 274.
Enthusiasm in the United States over the reforms of Pope Pius IX expressed itself in public gatherings in many of the large cities, the most important of which was the meeting at the Broadway Tabernacle in New York City on November 29, 1847.¹ For numbers, order, good feeling, and enthusiasm it had never been surpassed by any gathering held in the city.² A resolution was passed to the effect that a message of sympathy be sent to the Pontiff "to convey the sentiments with which we regard the enlightened and liberal policy of the Sovereign Pontiff." A letter was addressed by the committee in charge to Buchanan, requesting information concerning the "most sure and proper medium of communication".³ Buchanan replied that the American consul, Nicolas Broome, was absent from Rome, but, if the committee was willing to entrust the

¹. Proceedings of the Public Demonstration of Sympathy with Pope Pius IX and with Italy (New York, 1847).
². Howard R. Marraro, American Opinion on the Unification of Italy, p. 5.
³. James H. Titus, James W. White to Buchanan, Dec. 2, 1847, Stock, Consular Relations Between the United States and the Papal States (hereafter cited as Consular Relations), pp. 120-121.
documents to Ardisson, a native of the country acting as
vice-consul, "it will afford me great pleasure to transmit
them to him." Copies of the New York Herald, containing
the account of the Broadway meeting, found their way to
Italy, causing much enthusiasm for America. The legis-
lature of Louisiana adopted a resolution favoring diplomatic
relations with Rome and approving of the measures of Pope
Pius IX.

On the other side of the Atlantic, the Americans in
Rome prepared a demonstration to manifest their sympathy
on the occasion of the first session of the newly created
Council of State. They determined to make a national silk
flag and to go in a group to the meeting place of the
Council, bearing branches of laurel in their hands. This
project was defeated, however, by the intervention of the
Cardinal Secretary of State, who notified Ardisson that
the Pope prohibited the intervention of "any strange
flag."

4. Buchanan to Titus and White, Dec. 10, 1847,
Ibid., p. 121.

5. Mavrogi, p. 17.

6. Senate Miscellaneous Documents, No. 126, 30th

7. Ardisson to Buchanan, Nov. 17, 1847, Stock,
Consular Relations, p. 114.
Public opinion was now favorable toward the Popo, and the time was ripe to introduce the question of diplomatic relations with the Papal States. Intimations to the effect that the Papal authorities desired such relations had been received by the State Department. Browne, the American consul at Rome, in a letter to Buchanan dated June 1, 1847, declared that both the Cardinal Secretary of State, Gisii, and the Holy Father had expressed a desire for diplomatic relations. Browne also had forwarded to the State Department letters from the individuals connected with the Papal Government, expressing a desire for formal diplomatic relations. "The frequent relations", wrote Ardisson to Buchanan, "that I have with the Secretary of State, induce myself to communicate to your Excel. the great desire the Pontifical G. would have to enter into direct relations of trade with the United States, in order to tie together the bonds of friendship, subsisting since a long while."

Clark, a former secretary to the consulate at Rome, wrote Buchanan:

8. Marraro, p. 17.
10. Ardisson to Buchanan, Sept. 18, 1847, Ibid., p. 112.
It seems singular, that at this moment, when all the representatives of the different powers are here, some looking on with interest, others with jealousy at the daily liberal movements of the present new Pope Pius 9th, that we should have no proper representative here, and no doubt the Mexican minister made his tale appear in a favorable light to his Government in regard to the justness of the present war with that country.

Considering the time opportune to broach the question of diplomatic relations with the Papal States, President Polk in his Third Annual Message to Congress on December 7, 1847, mentioned that "the Secretary of State has submitted an estimate of the cost involved in 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." The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House considered the suggestion and concurred with the President's views, submitting a report to this effect on January 12, 1848. It now remained for the measure to be considered by Congress.

The provision for the establishment of a mission to the Papal States was hidden away in the "Bill to supply

11. Clark to Buchanan, July 17, 1847, Ibid., p. 95.
12. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897, IV, p. 551.
deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1848. It was worded as follows:

"for one quarter's salary for each of the chargés des affaires to the Papal States, Bolivia, Guatemala, and Honduras . . . $4500.00."
III
THE DEBATES IN THE HOUSE ON THE OPENING OF A MISSION AT ROME

I have been so often misrepresented by the paid agents of the Jesuits who hang around this Hall, and who quarrel over our land, that I have come prepared to-day.¹

With these words Louis C. Levin, the Native American representative from Pennsylvania, opened on March 7, 1843, the discussion on the proposed mission to the Papal States. His eloquent introductory speech clearly displayed the attitude of his party toward Catholicism.² Levin feared that the Church, through the agency of the Jesuits and the increased Catholic immigration, planned to gain

¹ Congressional Globe, 30th Congress, 1st Session, Mar. 7, 1843, p. 418. The material in this and the ensuing chapter is based on the debates as recorded in the Congressional Globe.

² The Native American Party was opposed to foreign immigration as endangering American institutions. With the increase in immigration from Ireland, due to the Great Famine and the oppressive measures of the British, the party became anti-Irish and anti-Catholic after 1840. "Unless some remedy be applied to this great and growing evil," declared Levin on the floor of the House, December 18, 1845, "the day is not far distant when the American born voter will find himself in a minority in his own land." Representative Chipman of Michigan inquired, "Who are Native Americans * * * but those who derived their very existence from foreigners?" Gordon of New York added, "Was it not they who were setting man against man, all over the land, and trying to excite our native-born citizens against their naturalized
political power in the United States. Increased Catholic immigration would endanger American liberties. "This country seems destined to be the grand theatre of Roman Catholic power--not American papsity, but the papistry of Rome . . . Shall we grow wise in time," asked Levin, "or shall we surrender up our rights without resistance?"

As proof of the insidious aims of the Pope to gain political power in America, Levin declared that Pope Gregory XVI had condemned the institution of slavery in America, and that Daniel O'Connell, the Irish patriot, in a celebrated letter to the Repealers of Cincinnati had told them to give their votes "to none but those who will assist you in carrying out the pious intentions of his Holiness the Pope". Thus American institutions, i.e. slavery, were to be overturned by Catholic control of the ballot box. As additional evidence of the plot against American liberties, Levin read an extract from a supposed lecture by the German historian Schlegel before the Austrian emperor in

---

which Schlagel had urged the sending of "refuse population" to America, thereby forming a distinct political organization. Thus absolutism might be established in America through the political power of the votes of Catholic immigrants, 5

From Levin's viewpoint diplomatic relations with the Pope would only open the way for the United States to become a dependency of Rome. The American minister at Rome would have no duties to perform, but the interests

5. Dickey, a Whig from Pennsylvania, concurred in Levin's fear of Catholic political power. Expressing some concern that Catholics might gain control in those states where the constitutional prohibition of the establishment of religion did not apply, he stated that a recent gathering of Catholic bishops had approved the Mexican cession, which increased the political and religious influence of the Church by the admission of six or seven million Catholics into the United States. Furthermore, he believed that the treaty especially made provision for the protection of the Catholic religion in the ceded territory. Brown, Democrat from Pennsylvania, answered this objection by pointing out that there was no guarantee that Protestants might not gain the controlling power and establish their religion. Against Levin's prejudice toward immigrants, Ingersoll, Democrat from Pennsylvania, asserted that the Italian people were "the very best medical, moral, and natural and political philosophers in the world." "What objection can he (Levin) possibly have to the Pope's sending us as many such men as he pleases?" he asked. [Ibid.], p. 441.
of Rome would be well served in this country by her minister, who would concentrate "the combined forces of foreign Roman Catholic nation, and the foreign Roman Catholic vote" to extend the political power of the "Roman priesthood". England, Levin declared, had learned her lesson from past experience with the Papacy and was wise enough to avoid diplomatic relations with the Pope. "Pass your bill", concluded Levin, "and from that hour Native Americanism means only the defense of Protestant rights and Protestant freedom against Papal tyranny and Jesuit aggression."

Levin's remarks did not go unchallenged. Suspicious of the evidence presented by Levin, Maclay, Democratic representative from New York, spent several days checking references, with the final conclusion that Levin had misrepresented facts. Challenging Levin on the floor of the House to prove that he had correctly quoted from Schlegel, Maclay forced him to admit that he may have been mistaken as to the author of his quotations. It was further pointed out that the Pope's encyclical on slavery was directed against the slave trade between South America and Africa and did not concern American slavery. "A bolder attempt to palm off misstatements upon the

---

credity of this House I have never witnessed,"
declared Maclay. Levin rejoined that the Pope's encyclical on slavery must be taken with Daniel O'Connell's letter as commentary. Brown of Pennsylvania branded Levin's concern over Southern rights, as shown by his introduction of Pope Gregory's encyclical on slavery, as a bid by the Native Americans to form an alliance with the Whigs of the South.

Throughout his entire speech and in his subsequent remarks Levin showed an extreme animosity toward the Jesuits. Because its ulterior motive was religious and political power, Jesuit education was contrary to American education, which inculcates freedom. "Sir", declared Levin, "the Jesuits are at work... The provisors and firebrands7 plunged into this House day after day are traceable to the secret operations of that order, which is now striking for the mastery of the world!" Since Jesuit power had declined in Europe, Levin maintained that America had now become the field of their activities. The Jesuits had been active in the effort to keep the Bible out of the public schools—8 "that same Bible which

7. A reference to the controversies over the slavery question
8. In 1849 Archbishop Hughes had protested the use of the Protestant Bible for Catholics in the public schools.
Mary gave her little boy George, whose precepts and whose principles led him, at the head of American troops, to achieve the freedom we now enjoy. 9

Pointing out Levin's reference to the "provisoes and firebrands" flung into the House by the Jesuits, Brown very cleverly turned Levin's appeal to Southern sympathies against him. If these provisoes were the work of Jesuits, how could Levin deny that he was working under Jesuit influence when he voted for the Wilmot Proviso? asked Brown. Brown declared he had received a resolution from a group of Native Americans opposing slavery. "Have the

9. Ibid., p. 421. Referring to Levin's "maldictions upon the Jesuits", Ingersoll expressed doubt that his colleague had ever seen one. Levin promptly raised his voice, "I think I see one now before me!" "Is that intended as a personal insult?" asked Ingersoll. "Certainly not", was Levin's immediate rejoinder. Later Levin explained that he considered his remark a compliment, since Ingersoll thought so highly of the Jesuits. Ingersoll offered to introduce Levin to the Jesuits at Georgetown. "I mean no offense when I say I want my colleague to go there, not only that he may learn charity, but also that he may learn from those same Jesuits—taste; and while I am ready to admit that he is an eloquent declaimer, I think he might derive important information not only in regard to the feelings of the heart, but the outpourings of his tongue." Levin was not impressed by this invitation to visit Georgetown. He explained that since he suffered from cramp, he thought it dangerous to visit for fear that he might have an attack while there and die, and then "nothing would satisfy my constituents that I had not been poisoned by the Jesuits". Ibid., p. 439, 442.
Jesuits moved these Native American commissioners to send this "firebrand" into this Hall?" he asked. If all the accusations against the Jesuits were true, they provided a greater reason to maintain a representative at Rome "to watch at the fountain head those movements and make them known to us." 10

Much of the argument in the House as well as in the Senate centered around the practicability of diplomatic relations from the commercial standpoint. Ingersoll asserted that the denial of the commercial advantages of diplomatic relations with the Papal States was not sound. He pointed out that the Pope had suggested a commercial league of the Italian states to include Trieste, where, with Hamburg in the north, much American cotton, tobacco, and sugar entered Europe. Ingersoll maintained it would be of advantage to have diplomatic relations with the leader of this league, just as a minister was accredited to the Court of Prussia, not because the United States enjoyed any considerable amount of trade with that power, but because Prussia was the head of the Zollverein. 11

In his concluding speech Brown of Pennsylvania advanced an argument independent of any present commercial advantages.


He cited the example of Great Britain, who sent diplomatic agents into a hitherto commercially undeveloped region for the purpose of developing trade and urged that the United States adopt this same policy.\(^{12}\)

Levin declared he could not justify a mission on commercial or any other grounds, and in this opinion Brown of Mississippi, a Democrat, and Dickey, Whig from Pennsylvania, concurred. According to Levin the American minister to Austria and the consuls stationed in Italy were quite competent to handle our commercial interests. "Does the gentleman forget", he retorted, "that Trieste is within the Austrian dominions; that Hamburg is separated by the breadth of Europe from the Papal States; and that over the waters of the broad Adriatic Papal Rome exercises no sway, nor could one Italian Zoll-Verein have any influence?\(^{13}\)

The liberal reforms effected by Pope Pius IX were regarded as another reason for opening diplomatic relations with the Papal States. In his message to the Thirtieth Congress President Polk had referred to the "interesting political events now in progress in these States"\(^{14}\) as a justification for the mission. Hilliard, Whig from Alabama,


\(^{13}\) *Congress Globe*, 50th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 443.

\(^{14}\) Richardson, IV, p. 561.
declared that a genuine reform had been initiated by the Pontiff; therefore the United States should have a minister there to "cheer the friends of freedom in all Europe by sending a minister from the United States of America . . . to reside at a court where hitherto the policy has been to crush all freedom of thought and action". After listing some of the reforms carried out by the Pope, he closed his speech with the warning that if a minister were not sent to the Vatican, Rome would be strengthened by being forced to work in secret. But, if the Papacy could be brought to establish intercourse "with a free Protestant nation . . . civil and religious liberty will achieve new triumphs". In his defense of the Pope's reforms Ingersoll went so far as to ask for a full mission instead of the simple charge in the bill, on the ground that "we are called by the circumstances to say whether we will or will not take part and lot in this great reform."

At the conclusion of his speech Brown of Pennsylvania made an eloquent appeal for American support of the Pope's reforms:

"Independently of all commercial advantages, there are other and higher grounds for sending a minister to Italy. Where is the American heart that does not beat in unison with that of Pope Pius in his efforts for the amelioration of the condition

of the Italians? Even supposing, as has been said, that he proposes no spiritual, and but little political reform, are not his efforts to improve the physical condition of his people worthy of American sympathy and American support? Yes, sir, there is enough, and more than enough, in all that is stirring the hearts and moving the Pope and the people of Rome and the Papal States, to induce us to send an American minister there, --if for nothing else, to cheer on, with his presence, both Pope and peasant, who are struggling to improve the conditions of their country, and again to raise its down-trodden people to the rank of men and freemen.16

In sharp contrast with this sympathy for the Pope's liberal tendencies, the opposition emphatically denied that the Pope had initiated any real reforms. Levin, the most caustic in his remarks, maintained that the Pope's reforms were merely of a superficial nature, not calculated to affect in the least the true nature of the Papal power, which remained as much an absolutism as ever.17 He spoke of the Pope's reforms as having "oiled the chains of his people", as but a "gilded thraldom" and tyranny "made amiable". Imputing an ulterior motive to the Pope's reforms, Levin said: "Pius understands human nature, and knows how to render the papal system popular by wreathing chains with rose blossoms". If the Pope had "struck down


17. Dickey could not see that the Pope had introduced any significant reforms, since he had not opened his territory to Protestants to propagate their faith. Cong. Globe, 30th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 442.
the power of the confessional, repealed the demoralizing
edict of celibacy, thrown open the gates of the monas-
tery or unbarred the iron bolts of the convent, (or)
separated church power from state authority", then he
might merit the sympathy of the American people. In
Levin's mind the Pope was "an ambitious demagogue", an
"intriguing, grasping, and ambitious priest". "Must he
also dream of consummating in his own person this revolt-
ing alliance between the crimes of heavy guilt and the
purity of youthful innocence?" asked Levin. If Rome were
a republic there would be no excuse to send an ambassador
to preserve the common principles of both; for opening
diplomatic relations with the Pope, there was no such
excuse. "We lend encouragement to a system of government
at open war with the happiness of mankind. We become the
patrons of an absolute monarch. We tell him to 'scourge
on, scourge on'!"

Objecting to the idea of a complimentary mission,
Levin claimed there was no precedent for sending representa-
tives to encourage reformers in other countries. The
United States had not sent ambassadors to the South
American states, Mexico, or Greece when they revolted.
Ingersoll contradicted this assertion, pointing out that
several men were sent as "commissioners" to encourage the
revolters. Both Webster and Clay had supported aid to
Greece. In his address Levin stated that to send an embassy to the Pope would be to compliment him on superficial reforms. Assuming that "embassies once opened are never closed", Levin maintained that it was not possible to compliment the Pope in this way, since after the Pope's death the mission must continue, although its purpose no longer existed.18

The imputation of political motives in establishing a mission to Rome was not absent from the debates. Dickey suggested that the President's purpose in suggesting the mission was to bid for Catholic votes, but this charge was indignantly denied by Brown, the Democrat from Pennsylvania, who asserted that his opponent draws largely on his imagination to form such a powerful and dangerous combination as he has done, under the direction of Mr. Polk, to purchase Democratic votes and spread the Catholic religion over the United States ... There is not, and ought not to be, any political question involved in these missions. Mr. Polk, it is to be presumed, recommended them because he thought they would promote the interests of the country, and not that they would aid any religious or political party.19

Brown of Pennsylvania regretted the introduction of religion into the arguments of the House. It had never been a policy of the United States to consider religion in the establishment of diplomatic or consular relations, and

18. Ibid., p. 419.
He could not see that it had any place in the discussion. It was an "incendiary subject", and its introduction into politics had "drenched the fairest portions of the earth with human blood".20 Objecting to Levin's emotional presentation, Ingersoll accused him of having brought into the House "an appeal to religious prejudice, which ought never to be invoked within these halls".21

The debates were not without personal rancor and disturbance. On one occasion, when he had been annoyingly interrupted by Levin, Brown pointed toward Levin with an accusing finger, shouting, "Yes! he--the gentleman from Pennsylvania--was the first to introduce the incendiary subject of religion into the politics of Philadelphia, and by his inflammatory harangues, produced all the incendiarism and bloodshed that for awhile covered it with gloom and disgrace. Yes, sir, he was the author of all the incendiary measures."22 Here the chairman interposed to declare Brown out of order, and, after considerable wrangling over this point of order, the House devolved into such a state of confusion that the chairman could not call the

20. Ibid., p. 442


22. Ibid., p. 430. Brown's reference here, of course, was to the Philadelphia riots, for which Levin and his Native Americans were largely responsible.
members to order "as his voice was drowned in the con-
fusion that prevailed on the floor".23

After the failure of all attempts at amendment, the
bill was passed by the House on March 8 and referred to the
Senate for approval or rejection. The final vote was 137
to 14.

23. Ibid., p. 431.
IV.

THE DEBATES IN THE SENATE ON THE MISSION TO ROME

In the Senate the debate flowed more smoothly than in the House, where the vituperative remarks of Levin had stirred up frequent storms in which the clear stream of dispassionate reasoning had been clouded by the appeal to emotion and prejudice. Nevertheless, personal rancor was not entirely absent from the deliberations.

The question of diplomatic relations with the Papal States was launched in the Senate with an auspicious start when Senator Benton, Democrat from Missouri, moved to strike out the words "chargé d'affaires", substitute "minister plenipotentiary", and increase the appropriation, thus providing an "agent of a rank more becoming the station and the objects to be accomplished". He explicitly set

---

1. Agreeing with Benton on the desirability of raising the dignity of the representative to the Papal States, Mangum, Whig from North Carolina, argued that the diplomatic representatives of the United States stood at the bottom of the whole diplomatic corps, a position not fitting for one of the greatest nations on earth. The Government would be wise to give our missions a more "imposing effect". Echoing these sentiments, Cass, Michigan Democrat, declared: "This is precisely one of those periods when, if we appear at a new court, we should appear under the most favorable circumstances". Cong. Globe, 30th Cong., 1st Sess., Appendix, p. 409.
Aside commercial reasons as inadequate to justify the mission, but justified it rather on the ground of the need for a representative of the United States in central Italy, "which is wonderfully scant in diplomatic representatives from the United States". The senator also supported the mission because of a sentimental attachment to the "grandeur that was Rome"—"that city, with which grand recollections must forever be associated—which was once the mistress of the world, and has been the head of the Christian church for a long period". 2

Although our commerce with the Papal States was negligible, Mangum asserted that it was a matter worthy of consideration. He proposed that, to avoid waste of public funds in the multiplication of diplomatic missions, one mission of the first grade be established to take care of the interests of the United States in the whole Mediterranean area. The logical location for such a mission would be Rome, "the great point of confluence of the intelligence and influential classes of the European world". 3

Senator Badger, North Carolina Whig, possessed a mind which ran in more practical channels than Benton's.

---

Sending a mission to Rome to express "respect to the
departed greatness of ancient Rome" to his mind was
unjustifiable. It would be far better to apply the money
to aid American students studying in Rome so that they
return to enrich the United States as "accomplished
painters and sculptors".

Would not the dispatch of a full minister to the
Papal States seem to disparage other powers, such as
Austria, with whom we had considerably more commerce, but
to whom the United States did not send a full minister? So
asked Senator Crittenden, Whig from Kentucky. But Senator
Fecte, Democrat from Mississippi, scoffed at fear of
offending Austria, the chief opponent of freedom in Italy.
Senator Miles, Connecticut Democrat, recommended a more
cautious policy: begin with a diplomatic representative
of a lower grade, and then, if circumstances demanded,
raise his position.

Senator Badger, like Levin in the House, represented
the religious viewpoint. However, unlike the volcanic
Levin, Badger's views were based on practical reasons
without any appeal to prejudice or emotion. He regarded
the proposed mission was "merely a religious mission on

5. Ibid., p. 477, 510, 511.
the part of the United States to the first bishop of
Europe". He went on to explain that the temporal power
of the Pope was secondary to his spiritual power, "the
appendage attached to the Episcopal see, for the purpose
of giving support and dignity to his religious character
and office". As a secular prince the Pope would not be
worthy of consideration; it was only from his spiritual
position that he derived his importance. Badger
continued:

The establishment of this mission will be
considered by the great Protestant interest of this
country as one undertaken for the purpose of giving
a new character to that particular church of which
the sovereign Pontiff is the head. It will be
regarded as placing him and his church in this
country upon a far different footing from that which
is occupied by other religious denominations.

The establishment of a mission to the Pope, according to
Badger, would be a departure from the principles of
toleration and non-interference in religious matters,
which the Constitution contemplates.

In answering Badger's argument, Senator Allen,
Democrat from Ohio, maintained that the religious affilia-
tion of the head of the government with whom the United
States intended to open diplomatic relations should not
affect the establishment of such relation. The mission
was to a government, not to a priest. America had no right

6. Ibid., p. 477.
to proscribe men or a government because of religious opinions. In his answer to this objection Badger restated his position:

The point of my objection is that this is a mission—not as the Senator from Ohio supposed, to a member of a particular church; but that it is sending a mission to a spiritual sovereign, who is the head of the Catholic Church. And I said, and now repeat, that the Protestant communities of this country will regard that step as a great departure from the principles which have regulated our intercourse with other nations. I do not object to the mission because the person to whom it is to be sent is a member of a particular church, or because he happens to be the head of the Catholic church. I object to it because he is a spiritual potentate, and there are no interests of the United States in his dominions which require the presence of a diplomatic agent of this country.

Cass echoed Allen's argument, asserting that the Government had no concern with the Pope as a religious leader, but merely as a temporal prince: "We do not propose to send a diplomatic agent to him as a clerical personage, but as one of the acknowledged Powers of the world." He pointed out that other sovereigns combine religious and temporal functions as the king of England, tsar of Russia, and many of the petty princes of the German Empire before

7. Ibid., p. 512.
8. Ibid., p. 514.
its dissolution. 10

Opinion on the effectiveness of the Papal reforms was divided, as in the House. Badger declared that the Pope had introduced no fundamental reforms—"he has surrendered none of the absolute powers which adorn and strengthen the tiara which he wears". 11 From Badger's viewpoint it was impossible to congratulate the Roman people by a mission for the simple reason that they had no representative body to whom such congratulations could be tendered. The Pope, maintained Badger, had taken no steps toward religious or civil freedom. He had not granted a legislative assembly, freedom of the press, religious toleration, or in any way abridged the Papal power. If Americans wished to send a mission to express sympathy with republican institutions, 

10. Ibid., pp. 405-406. Senator Dix of New York, a Democrat, could see no reason for objection to the mission since it was in no sense a religious mission. The United States sent a diplomatic representative to China, he said, and the Emperor of China claims to be "sole viceregent of the Supreme Being". Ibid., p. 408. The fallacy in the objections of Senators Cass and Dix to Badger's argument is a failure to perceive that the analogy between Papal spiritual-temporal power and the temporal-spiritual power of other sovereigns is not sound. In the former the temporal power exists only to safeguard the spiritual power, which is not the case with the latter. The Pope is primarily a spiritual sovereign, while the Emperor of China was primarily a temporal sovereign, his spiritual function being secondary and intended to give support to the temporal authority.

Switzerland or San Marino would be ideal, stated Badger.\(^{12}\)

In the defense of the mission Senator Foote, the Democrat from Mississippi delivered an apology "with all his Jupiter Tonans thundering eloquence". He lauded the Pope as the "head of the great reform movement of the European world", "the man who has dared to borrow light from this country", "The Pope", claimed Foote, "is leading in the great regenerative movement which already threatens the speedy extinction of monarchical government throughout the civilized world; and does it become us, in a spirit of heartless indifference, to decline even a cold and formal recognition of the struggle for popular freedom?\(^{13}\)

\(^{12}\) Ibid., pp. 512-514. Senator Butler, Democrat from South Carolina, on the whole accorded with Badger's views. He could not see how a mission from the United States would further American interests or in any way make an impression on the institutions of the Papal States. "It is not to be supposed", he argued, "that he (the Pope) would renit any of that intolerance by reason of being complimented by a mission from us." Furthermore, remarked Butler, since the Pope did not carry out his reforms with any reference to our institutions, it would be an idle compliment to send him a mission. "What occupation would he have?" queried Butler. "There would be nothing for him to do. He might, it is true, employ himself in examining the ruins of the Forum where Tully declaimed, or he might look for the Tarpeian rock, and make himself familiar with those classic scenes, and come back with classic associations." Cong. Globe, 30th Cong., 1st Sess., Appendix, p. 603-604.

\(^{13}\) Cong. Globe, 30th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 311. Foote's enthusiasm waxed so strong that he even went so far as to confer on the Pope the high title of "man of the age". Good Whig that was, Hale could not let pass the opportunity to
Cass arose in defense of the Pope's reform measures. He excused the Pontiff for slowness on the ground that the Pope was hindered by near-by military powers, who did not favor reform, and by the nature of his people, who had been educated under a system different from the American. Several extracts from the London papers and letters from Lord Palmerston were read in support of his contention that the Pope had initiated real reforms, leading ultimately to a constitution and the separation of the ecclesiastical and secular branches of the government.14

The argument, advanced also in the House, that the mission was proposed by the Democrats for political reasons made its appearance in the Senate. The charge, brought forward by Hale, that the mission was "a mere pandering to the Roman Catholic voters of this country"15 led to a disdainful denial by Foote, who regarded the charge as not worth any "elaborate or formal vindication". Furthermore, remarked Foote, Catholics themselves would "scorn to be used for such a purpose".16 Expressing concern over the

---

16. Ibid., p. 511.
disposal of the newly created positions, Senator Miles, Connecticut Democrat, inquired whether the men sent on the missions would look after our commercial interests or whether they would be "mere politicians, stump orators, who are to be rewarded with places for political services". 17

Hargum lamented the tendency to multiply missions as a "snug provision for political friends," but stated that he would vote for the measure, if only to show that he was impervious to sectarian influences. 18

Viewing the mission as entirely unnecessary, Senator Davis of Massachusetts, a Whig, claimed that as a "complimentary mission" it set a very bad precedent, 19 while Senator Webster, also a Whig from Massachusetts, desired to strike out of the bill all the missions on the ground that, since the bill was to appropriate money to meet deficiencies, it was not appropriate to create new offices. 20

As in the House, opinion on the commercial advantages of the mission differed. In Badger's opinion American

17. Ibid., p. 509.
18. Ibid., p. 512.
19. Ibid., p. 510.
commerce with the Papal States was negligible. The consuls were quite competent to take care of it. Hale concurred in this view, adding that Haiti merited on commercial grounds a diplomatic agent more than the Papal States. Mangum in his plea for the consolidation of the Mediterranean missions opposed this view. Maintaining that our commercial interests in South America had been shamefully neglected to the advantage of Great Britain, Miles thought that a chargé d'affaires was justifiable in the Papal States. Cass also thought that our commerce and the residence of American citizens in Rome warranted a diplomatic representative. Remarkling that the United States should share with Great Britain in the lucrative Italian trade, Dix maintained that "a discreet and intelligent man" could accomplish much toward the development of American commerce in central Italy. John C. Calhoun, Democrat from South Carolina, favored the mission because the Pope was the central power of reform in Italy and his

22. Ibid., p. 510.
23. Ibid., p. 512.
24. Ibid., p. 509.
26. Ibid., p. 408.
influence might be beneficial in protecting American commerce from the violence of revolutionary excess.\textsuperscript{27}

Both the amendment to provide for a full diplomatic representative to the Papal States and the amendment to strike out the words "Papal States" from the bill failed to pass by comfortable majorities,\textsuperscript{28} and the bill was returned to the House of Representatives for action upon minor amendments to its other provisions. Toward the end of March the bill was finally passed by both Houses, and the mission to Rome an established fact.\textsuperscript{29}

An analysis of the debates and the voting on the mission to Rome suggest that the mission was not a party measure. In the House, Hilliard, a Whig, was outstanding in his approval of the measure, while Butler, a Democrat in the Senate, was definitely opposed to the measure. As should be expected, however, the majority of the Democrats supported the desires of the Administration, while the Whigs and Native Americans opposed it. Former Whig connections with the Native Americans had driven many immigrants and

\textsuperscript{27.} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 410. It is interesting to note that the two famous antagonists, Webster and Calhoun, opposed one another on the issue of the mission to the Papal States. \textit{v.p.}

\textsuperscript{28.} Senator Badger’s proposal to exclude the mission was defeated 7 to 36, while Senator Hannegan’s proposal to raise it to the dignity of a full mission lost by a vote of 19 to 33. \textit{Ibid.}, p. 410, 425.

\textsuperscript{29.} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 521.
Catholics into the Democratic fold. Of the two main
opponents to the Roman mission Levin was an ardent Native
American, while Dickey was a Whig. The Democrats supported
the measure for three main reasons: (1) to support the project
of a Democratic Administration, (2) to oppose the Native
Americans, and (3) to show that Democrats were unaffected
by religious prejudice. 30

30. Feiertag, (Sister) Loretta, American Public
Opinion on Diplomatic Relations between the United States
and the Papal States, p. 35.
THE CHARGESHIP OF JACOB L. MARTIN

After the creation by Congress of the mission at Rome the position was offered to Jacob L. Martin, a native of North Carolina, who had had some diplomatic experience as secretary of the American legation at Paris from 1844 to 1847 and as charge d'affaires there for several months. Martin also had occupied important positions in the State Department, having been chief clerk of the Department from 1840 to 1841 and Secretary of State ad interim, March 5-4, 1841.\(^1\)

There is some evidence of the qualifications which Martin brought to his new post. Apparently, he was an enthusiastic and conscientious worker. "I have been in Paris now four years", he wrote Buchanan, the Secretary of State, "and in all that time I have not left my post for twenty-four hours." His despatches are lengthy and replete with detail, revealing him as an astute analyst of social behaviour. "I have everywhere remarked", he wrote Buchanan, "that when the middle classes, who make revolutions or favor them in the beginning, begin to suffer from them in their business or comfort, a reaction in favor of authority

\(^{1}\) Leo F. Stock, United States Ministers to the Papal States, P.In.
commences".  

J. C. Hooker, an American resident in Rome, declared of Martin that "he . . . had already endeared many to him by his gentlemanly manners, pleasing address, with his knowledge of the French and Italian languages".  

Martin's unselfishness shows itself in his statement to Buchanan that he is grateful "that no one has been displaced to make room for me, and that my advancement is not founded upon the pain or depression of another".  

In his instructions to Martin, Buchanan emphasized the dual character of the Papal Government:

There is one consideration which you ought always to keep in view in your intercourse with the Papal authorities. Most, if not all, the Governments which have Diplomatic Representatives at Rome are connected with the Pope as the head of the Catholic Church. In this respect the Government of the United States occupies an entirely different position. It possesses no power whatever over the question of religion. All denominations of Christians stand on the same footing in this country, — and every man enjoys the inestimable right of worshipping his God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Your efforts, therefore, will be devoted 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. You will carefully avoid even the appearance of interfering in ecclesiastical affairs, whether these relate to the United States or any other portion of the world. It might be proper, should you deem it advisable, to make these views known, on some suitable occasion, to the Papal Government;

---

2. No. 1, Martin to Buchanan, May 1, 1848, Ibid., pp. 4-7.


4. See note 2.
so that there may be no mistake or misunderstanding on this subject.

In his reply Martin stated that he would "not fail to impress upon the Papal authorities, on all suitable occasions, our inestimable principles of perfect liberty of conscience."5

Martin manifested a keen appreciation of the peculiar position of the Papacy as a theocratic state and of the social problems which arose therefrom. Without the Pope, Martin asserted, Rome would be but "the corpse or skeleton of departed greatness and glory". Since Rome must necessarily be a theocratic state, those who wished to liberalize its institutions should consider this fact.

In applying to it, therefore, the forms and administration of constitutional government, these peculiar and exceptional circumstances must be permitted to have their weight... Putting aside the religious view, the Papacy is not only a great, but venerable fact, around which the shadows of nearly twenty centuries gather in awful array; which has witnessed the rise and fall of many empires; which has survived thrones, and principalities, and powers. Young liberty should not exhaust her efforts against this rock of ages. She should conciliate what is an immense if not irresistible moral power. The alliance of freedom and religion were viscer than their conflict. This is the obvious dictate of prudence, of common sense, of necessity.

5. No. 2, Buchanan to Martin, April 5, 1849, Ibid., p. 2.
7. No. 2, idem to idem, Aug. 29, 1848, Ibid., pp. 8-15.
Martin did not agree, however, with those who wished to leave the power in the Pope's hands in order gradually to prepare the people for constitutional government. This to him would be like "not going into water until we know how to swim". The Pope, Martin declared, was forced by the march of events in the rest of Europe to grant a constitution although he did not think the time opportune. The hatred of the people toward the Jesuits forced the Pontiff to expel them from the Papal territories. "That the first act of an emancipated people should be a violation of the first principles of liberty and justice, was to him (the Pope) a disenchancing experience, if not an ominous warning." 8

The exponents of republicanism in Italy were not slow to urge the new American representative in Italy to espouse their cause. Martin was aware of the fact that the party in Italy which favored institutions similar to America's would look to the American representative "for countenance, if not support". Even before his departure from Paris, Martin was solicited by agents of the republican party in the states of Lombardy and Venetia, who urged him to show sympathy for their cause "and even to take Milan on my way to Rome that the presence of the representative of the great American Republic might be turned to account against

8. No. 1, Martin to idem, May 1, 1849, Ibid., pp. 4-7.
the King of Sardinia." Martin, however, declined their solicitations on the grounds that it was not consistent with his position and duty or "with the respect due to the independence of nations" to be a propagandist or display a hostile attitude toward a ruler with whom the United States was on friendly terms. Although disavowing any interference in Italian affairs, Martin expressed his sympathy for the cause of Italian independence. "While taking no active part or prominent part in these controversies", he wrote in his first despatch to Buchanan, "I shall deem it my duty, as far as that policy and obvious discretion will allow, to throw my humble weight in the scale of Italian independence."

When Martin received appointment to the chargership at Rome, he was in Paris, whence he proceeded to England for a few weeks. Upon his return to Paris, he found that the wave of revolutions which was to engulf all Europe in 1848 had just begun with the July Revolution, in which Louis Philippe lost his throne. This tide was destined to reach Rome also, but Martin's death prevented his seeing the Revolution through in Italy. After considerable delay, occasioned by revolutionary activity, Martin arrived in the Eternal City on the second of August, the worst possible time of the year, when the dreaded "Roman fever" was rampant.

---

9. Ibid.
and "even the most acclimated think it hazardous to encounter the scourge of malaria." Martin secured lodgings on the ground floor of a dwelling overlooking a garden on side of the Pincian Hill, a pleasant but unhealthy place. Hooker urged him to seek a better location to no avail.

A few days after his arrival Martin sent a copy of his letters of credence to the Cardinal Secretary of State with a request for an audience to present the original. The unsettled situation in Rome, due to news of the course of the revolution in other parts of Europe, occasioned some delay in reply, but at last on the 19th of the same month Martin was received by both the Cardinal and the Pope. Displaying great cordiality, Pius took Martin by the hand when he entered and again at the conclusion of the audience. The Pontiff expressed pleasure in entering into diplomatic relations with a nation "for which he entertained so high a regard" and spoke with satisfaction of the condition of the Catholic Church in the United States. Alluding to his efforts to introduce reforms into his states, Pius mentioned the difficulties encountered in preparing "his people for an order of things to which they had not been accustomed." Martin observed that Pius spoke with emotion on this subject,

10. Ibid.

"yet with a serenity of countenance and suavity of manner, very touching and impressive". In his reply to the Pope, Martin did not let pass the opportunity of reminding the Holy Father that the Catholic Church in America owed its prosperity to the American principles of freedom and equality. 12

Buchanan had reminded Martin that the relations with the Papal States should be of a commercial character.

Trusting that the spirit of reform abroad in Italy would lead to the removal of restrictions on trade, Buchanan requested Martin to secure all information possible relative to the improvement of our trade, not only with the Papal States, but with the rest of Italy. "The President desires", he wrote to Martin, "to conclude Commercial Treaties with the Papal States separately, or with the Commercial League of which they may form a part; and only awaits the necessary information to confer upon you full instructions and powers for this purpose". 15 Martin replied that the "din of war and the confusion of popular agitation" prevented any early possibility of concluding a commercial agreement with the Papal States, which were involved in problems affecting their very existence. Nor did he hold out much hope for

12. No. 2, Martin to idem, Aug. 20, 1848, Ibid., pp. 8-16.
any commercial union of the Italian states.\textsuperscript{14}

On August 26, at 10:30 in the morning, Martin passed away after a short illness. A few days before his death Hooker called on him, and finding him in bed with a fever urged him to summon a doctor. On the morning of Martin's death, Hooker spent a half hour with him, converse-
sing on the despatch which Martin wanted to send that day. After Hooker's departure, Doctor Pantaleone again visited Martin and left him some medicine. Martin told his servant that he wished to sleep awhile and to awaken him at the proper time. When the servant returned he found Martin dead, lying on his side, appearing as if he had fallen asleep. With him were found several cupping glasses, the kind used in apoplectic attacks. Dr. Pantaleone stated the cause of death to be an attack of apoplexy.\textsuperscript{15}

Following Martin's death, the care of the legation fell upon A. Ardisson, a Frenchman, who acted as American vice-consul. Nicolas Browne, the consul, did not take his consular duties very seriously, occasionally absenting himself from Rome without leaving information as to his

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{14} No. 2, Martin to Buchanan, Aug. 20, 1848, \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 8-15.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
Therefore, Ardisson took upon himself the duty of informing the Secretary of State concerning Martin’s demise and of arranging the funeral. "The late Mr. Martin", wrote Ardisson to Buchanan, "caries (sic) regrets of every persons who have been acquainted with him; the whole diplomatic body shall assist to his funeral at 8 o'clock in the evening of the 28th". Because he drew over the amount allowed by the Government for the funeral expenses, Ardisson ran into difficulties with Hooker Pakenham and Company who had charge of the funeral. Martin's bankers, Green and Company, refused to pay Hooker Pakenham and Company for the funeral expenses, and the latter made demands on the consulate for reimbursement. "God knows", Ardisson declared to Buchanan, "in what state of wealth and splendour is the consulate. I entreat you Sir, to issue orders relative to the affairs, avoiding disagreeable debate, particularly when it is for the last duty rendered to a representative of the wisest nation of the world, so much admired by Europe, and enjoying the higher reputation in Rome".


17. Ardisson to Buchanan, Aug. 29, 1848, Ibid., p. 124.

18. Idem to idem, Oct. 25, 1848, Ibid.
The diplomatic relations between the United States and the Papal States had opened auspiciously with the chargéship of Martin. His early death was a loss to the foreign service and a loss to the cause of friendly relations with Rome.
VI

LEWIS CASSE, JR., AS MINISTER TO THE PAPAL STATES

After Martin's death, Lewis Cass, Jr., whose father was to be secretary of state under Buchanan from 1857 to 1860, was appointed to the position of chargé d'affaires at Rome. On January 6, 1849, Buchanan forwarded to him his commission and the following month his passport was sent with instructions to proceed at once to Rome in order to furnish the Department with information relative to conditions there. 1 After spending a week in Paris making the necessary preparations for the journey, Cass arrived in Rome on April 2.

Following the death of Martin, the internal affairs of the Papal States underwent a profound change. Pio Nono had been one of the most popular leaders of the Italian liberal movement of 1848. But when he saw that that movement might involve the Italians in war with Austria, he withdrew his support, asserting that, as father of all Christians, he could not engage in a war against the Austrians, who were equally the children of the Church with the Italians. The Pope's subjects, fired by enthusiasm for

for the cause of Italian liberty and filled with animus toward the Austrians, now turned against the Holy Father. The Pope's minister of state, Rossi, was murdered while on his way to open parliament. On the following day the Pope himself was besieged in the Quirinal but fled from Rome in disguise on November 24, 1848, to the Neapolitan fortress of Gaeta, whence he issued a bull of excommunication against all those who participated in the public proceedings during his absence. In Rome a republic was proclaimed, and the temporal power declared extinct.

It was this situation in Rome which caused the State Department some perplexity. Should Mr. Cass be accredited to the Papal Government in exile or to the newly formed Roman Republic? In a cabinet meeting on the 3rd of February, 1849, the problem was discussed, and Buchanan, the Secretary of State, suggested that Cass should be sent to Rome without accreditation to either the Papal Government or the Roman Republic, "with instructions to report to his Government the exact condition of things on his arrival there, and that his credentials could be sent on receiving this information."2 The Cabinet concurred in Buchanan's suggestion, and Cass was notified to this effect. It was the policy of the United States, Buchanan informed Cass,

to recognize existing governments, regardless of their legitimacy, provided they showed some stability. The Roman Republic did not yet qualify on that score; in Buchanan's opinion the return of the Pope was "highly probable, if not absolutely certain". However, since the Pope still remained at Gaeta, the United States Government could not recognize him for "it is only as a temporal Prince, exercising actual authority within his own Dominions, that the Government of the United States can have any relations with His Holiness".

In his first despatch to the Secretary of State, Cass described the scene of utter confusion he found upon arrival in Italy, a confusion and state of misery "not witnessed since the middle ages". Acts of barbarity seemed to be the rule of the day—"the atrocities committed on either side are said never to have been exceeded". "It would really seem", wrote Cass, "in many instances, which have come under my own observation, as if the people were bent on making democracy appear ridiculous". The conduct of the people and authorities in Genoa, Leghorn, and Ancona, in Cass's opinion was "fitter for the records of a lunatic asylum than those of history".

In Rome Cass found the new republic financially

---
embarrassed. Its revenues dried up, the only source of income lay in the confiscation of ecclesiastical property. Cass even feared that the art galleries would be despoiled. The promises of the government seemed to inspire little confidence. The rural class had opposed the revolution from the beginning, and the urban class were now commencing to associate prosperity and good order with the Pope's government. "There is now every probability that in the course of a month the Pontiff will be restored to the Vatican," declared Cass.

Soon after Cass's arrival in the Eternal City, the authorities of the republic began a concerted effort to secure from Cass recognition of their government. Prince Canino, President of the Assembly, Giuseppe Galletti, Mazzini, one of the triumvirs, and other officials of the executive department urged Cass "to a degree amounting to importunity" to present his credentials and establish diplomatic relations with the new republic. The leaders of the republic were not unaware that recognition by the United States would strengthen the position of the already precarious government. Cass was entertained lavishly at dinners, seats at the opera were provided, and every possible pressure was brought to bear upon him, but he remained adamant. When finally pressed to the point where he could

---

4. No. 1, Cass to Clayton, April 9, 1849, Ibid., pp. 18-25.
General Oudinot. They arrived at Civita Vecchia, the sea-
port of Rome, on the morning of April 24 where the author-
ities allowed the peaceful occupation of the city.

In this crisis the Roman Government was unable to
decide on a course of action. After some vacillation, which
elicited expressions of contempt from the people, a bulletin
was issued calling upon the people to resist the foreign
invasion. Cass did not anticipate a very vigorous resis-
tance to the occupation. "The Romans of the present day",
he maintained, "are not disposed to strike, even for honor
or for right, without very good prospect of success".7

Later events, however, proved Cass’s conclusion to be wrong.
Cass was now drawn into an active part in the political
developments occurring about him. The President of the
Assembly, Prince Camino, and other government authorities
requested Cass to present the Government’s ultimatum to
the French commander at Civita Vecchia. This ultimatum
embraced four main points: (1) the ministry demanded an
armistice of fifteen days, (2) within that period the
ministry would submit to a plebiscite the question of Papal
restoration, and, if the vote were affirmative, the
constitution would be altered, (3) at the end of that period,
the French must withdraw; and (4) if these demands were

7. No. 3, Cass to Claytor, April 27, 1849, Ibid.,
pp. 32-35.
not met, war would ensue. In Cass's opinion, the real motive of the request for his service was to create the impression that the United States favored the cause of the republic. Whether Cass intervened with the French on behalf of the Roman Republic is not entirely clear. In his despatch to Clayton on April 27, he stated that he was "urged, by the common considerations of humanity, to prevent the effusion of blood, to promote the cause of liberty, to be the beater of these terms", but that he declined because, in his words, "the present occasion is not one when I could assume a mission of this character with propriety, or even, if unattended with objections, with any prospect of efficaciousness".8

This is Cass's own official version of the affair, but other sources give a different story. De Lesseps, who headed the French expedition, stated that Cass did intercede on behalf of the Roman Republic, that he left a paper with General Oudinot containing the proposals of Charles Bonaparte,9a Vice-President of the Roman Assembly, to which Cass had joined a fourth, "in which it was proposed that he should sign the agreement as Minister of the United States."9

The Italian historian Ferini wrote:

9a. Son of Lucien Bonaparte, Napoleon I's brother.
The General (Oudinot), scarcely casting a glance on these articles, so contrary to the commission given M. Lesseps, and so entirely at variance with his own ideas, answered Mr. Cass, that, on the score of humanity, he was desirous of peace, but that beyond all he desired an honorable peace, and a speedy conclusion; and then, without saying anything further, he took leave of the Ambassador, and gave no account of the interview to M. Lesseps.¹⁰

In his study of Pius IX, Legge states that Cass visited De Lesseps and offered his aid in concluding an agreement between the opposing parties.¹¹ The only solution that preserves Cass's integrity is that, after sending his despatch, he acceded to the pressure put upon him and visited the French commander, never mentioning the fact in later despatches.

The following day after the delivery of the ultimatum of the Roman Republic, the French army left Civita Vecchia to advance on Rome. On the 29th of April, the advance guard of the French troops was visible from the walls of Rome. When the head of the French column appeared, the Roman army took up its position outside the walls and began cannonading from batteries set up on all the high ground. The French continued to advance with considerable loss of men until stopped at the Vatican wall by Garibaldi. Thus began the


¹¹. Legge, Pius IX, p. 277, quoted in Stock, U. S. Ministers, p. 34.
The reaction of the Roman populace to the siege was contrary to Cass's earlier expectations. What the Republic's own measures, Papal abuses, and the cause of freedom could not do, the appearance of the enemy outside the walls accomplished for the republic by combining all classes in enthusiastic support. "I have not, until now", Cass said, "realized how deeply the Roman heart and soul are engaged in the cause, and how united the whole country is to resist foreign dictation." Everyone capable of bearing arms, "old and young", entered into the army, and the sums demanded by the government were "contributed with cheerfulness and alacrity". Barricades were erected in the streets, shops closed, business halted. Women and children worked on the ramparts. "The conduct of the Romans", declared Cass, "has certainly redeemed, to a great extent, their degenerated reputation for bravery and courage". On June 14 the prospects of the republic looked so favorable that Cass could write that confidence arising from the successful resistance and the unanimity and enthusiasm for the cause of the Republic "combine to render the permanent establishment of the existing government highly probable".

12. The following account of the siege of Rome and the action of Cass is derived from his despatches, nos. 4, 5, 6, and 7, found in Stock, U. E. Ministers, pp. 56-63. Other material not obtained from this source is indicated in the footnotes.
But this favorable picture was not destined to endure. Conditions in the city grew daily worse. The Guards were no longer able to maintain order, pillaging commenced, assassinations were frequent, and the lives of those opposed to the republic were endangered. The number of foreign vagabonds, robbers and plunderers became so great that the repeatabable portions of society became alarmed. In this exigency, Cass proved himself a source of aid to many. Many of the best families of Rome, including that of Prince Canino, the President of the Assembly, sought the protection of the American flag to guard them against plundering. Cass graciously extended this protection. Toward his own countrymen Cass was no less solicitous. When the city was threatened by bombardment, he wrote Captain Hunter, commander of the steamer "Alleghany", which was near Leghorn, to move his vessel without delay to Civita Vecchia. The government, appreciative of the support given it by Americans, offered a guard to those Americans who wished to leave the city and embark on the "Alleghany".

13. In May, 1852, Cass was presented by the priests of the Propaganda with a token of appreciation for the protection extended by him to their institution during the closing days of the siege. Cass received two beautifully illustrated volumes, written in sixty-eight different languages. In one volume the right of sanctuary was granted Cass in perpetuity. Marraro, p. 792.
The situation in the city now became critical.

Intercepted by the French cavalry, the market supplies failed. The cutting of the aqueducts by order of General Oudinot produced a shortage of water. A pestilence threatened from the unburied bodies in the districts where the action was heaviest. The fall of the city was imminent.

"I am just informed", wrote Cass in a postscript to his despatch of June 14, 1849, "that a considerable breach has been affected in the walls, near the Flaminian Gate. Shells and balls are falling throughout the city, day is closing, and it is expected that the grand attack will be made tomorrow."

The French army entered Rome on July 3. For two days previous all fighting had ceased, since the Romans had exhausted their supply of ammunition. The Roman Assembly was forcibly dissolved and the members expelled from their seats at the point of the bayonet. It became a familiar sight to the Romans to see the French soldiers encamped in the squares and market places, their fires kindled in the center of the streets. "Already", declared Cass, "all classes of Romans are to be seen mingling with the foreign troops--some fraternising, and others looking with childish wonder upon the habits of the strangers". It is an old story, repeated after every conquest. "To an American", Cass exclaimed, "there can scarcely be presented a spectacle
more disgusting and contemptible, than the sight of a people
who cannot settle their domestic quarrels, organize their
own form of government, or maintain the indispensable
requisites of law and order in their own streets, without
the help of foreign politicians (sic) or foreign soldiers.¹⁴

Following the capture of the city, Cass and the
American consul, Nicolas Brown, were engaged in extending
aid and protection to those whose lives were endangered by
the French occupation. Passports and letters were given to
leaders in the Provisional Government, who now were forced
to flee for their lives. Cass states that he gave "open
letters" to four individuals, among whom were Mazzini,
Prince Camino, and Avezzana. Mazzini received his passport
under the name of George Moore, with a letter of introduc-
tion to the American consul at Genoa. "The life interest of
Mazzini has always been dedicated to the cause of liberty
and independence", wrote Cass.¹⁵ The great Garibaldi also
was a recipient of American kindness. Cass sent a note to
Garibaldi by Ardisson, the American vice-consul, requesting
Garibaldi to meet him at the Hotel de Russie. On the way
Garibaldi encountered Cass, who offered him the services
of an American corvette anchored at Civita Vecchia—probably

¹⁴. No. 1, Cass to Clayton, April 9, 1849, Stock,
U. S. Ministers, pp. 18-25.

¹⁵. No. 14, Idem to Idem, Sept. 20, 1849, Ibid.,
pp. 57-59, Ibid., p. 59n.
the "Alleghany"—to transport him and his friends to America. Garibaldi refused, but this offer of American aid was not forgotten, for Garibaldi recorded it in his memoirs.

Cass's assistance to the revolutionists did not cease upon the return of the Papal authorities. In 1861, Cass received information that thirteen young Romans, among whom were five counts and one marquis, were imprisoned in the dungeons of D'Anzo and Saint Angelo for participation in the revolution. The government consented to exile them, but no European government would harbor republicans. Cass suggested to the Papal authorities that the men be exiled to California, and he paid $3000 for their transportation. The Cardinal Secretary of State accepted the proposal and released the prisoners.16

During the French occupation of the city, the American consul, Nicolas Browne, became involved in a disagreeable incident with the French army. Two of Browne's Italian servants had repeatedly insulted French soldiers who passed by the consulate. A crowd gathered at the door of the consulate, despite an order prohibiting such gatherings. One of the group drew a poignard on the soldiers. Oblivious of the character of the house, a passing patrol entered, seized the individual in question and another who

was recognized as a deserter from the French army. Browne asserted that the soldiers were aware of the character of the house from the American flag hung over the entrance. They persisted in entering, ascended the stairs and entered the parlor where Mrs. Browne met them, remonstrating "with much indignation" on the intrusion. According to Browne, the soldiers displayed a violent and menacing attitude, one of them even drawing his sword. They finally withdrew, taking with them the two Italians, who had been applying for passports. Browne's indignation was so great that he threatened immediate departure from Rome, but Cass finally persuaded him to present the case to General Cudinot. The General listened politely to Browne's complaint and ordered an investigation. The next day Cass received a letter of apology and the two prisoners were released.17

On November 19, 1849, Cass proceeded to the Quirinal to present his letter of credence to the Cardinal Secretary of State Antonelli. He was received with due ceremony at the entrance by the Pontifical Guard and escorted to the Cardinal. After presenting his credentials, Cass made a short address in which he conveyed the good wishes of the American people and government. "This mission, recently established", stated Cass, "is a proof of the desire of the American people to extend the relations between the two

countries, and to place their intercommunication upon a surer foundation. I shall esteem myself happy if, in the discharge of my duties, I can do anything to strengthen the bonds, which already unite the two countries together:"

"There is an evident desire," wrote Cass to Clayton, "to cultivate the most friendly relations with the United States, and I shall endeavor so to comport myself, as to do nothing on my part calculated to diminish this policy."

The Pope returned on April 12, 1859, to Rome, where he was received at one of the main gates by the diplomatic corps, among whom was Cass, conspicuous in that brilliant assemblage because of the simplicity of his uniform. In Saint Peter's, a solemn Te Deum of thanksgiving was sung, at which the Pontiff officiated. After the ceremony he was conducted by the diplomatic corps to the Vatican, where in the throne room he exchanged greeting with each member of the corps, afterwards retiring to his private apartments. The Pope was a changed man. His unhappy experiment with liberalism made him a confirmed reactionary, and from this


19. "The simplest dress, prominent also by the absence of all decorations, was that of the United States Minister, Colonel Cass". R. de Cesare, p. 6.

20. No. 24, Cass to Clayton, April 20, 1850, Stock, U. S. Ministers, pp. 66-68,
time on the tendency of the Papal Government was to return
to pre-revolutionary policy. 21

A short time after the Pope's return, Cass was
accorded his first audience. It was "cordial to a high
degree". Pius took Cass by the hand, assuring him of the
great pleasure he had in resuming diplomatic relations "with
a country for which he entertained a very great regard". He
mentioned "with much feeling" the expressions of sympathy
and the "contributions of pecuniary assistance" received
from Catholic Americans during the recent revolution. Allud-
ing to Cass's services rendered during the siege of Rome,
the Pontiff voiced his intention of expressing to the Presi-
dent his gratitude. Pius spoke of his attempted reforms
and the difficulties he met in introducing them, "adding
that he had learned that it required much caution and
prudence to prepare his people for an order of things to
which they had not been accustomed". In his reply Cass
expressed the interest of the President and the American
people in the Pope's reforms and did not fail to remind the
Pope that the prosperity of the Catholic religion in America
was due to the freedom, equality, and toleration which it
enjoyed. 22

21. No. 42, Idem to Webster, May 24, 1851, Ibid.,
p. 85-86.

22. No. 24, Idem to Clayton, April 20, 1850, Ibid.,
p. 66-68.
In 1853 the diplomatic representative of the United States in Rome was elevated to the rank of minister resident. However, this promotion did not bring Cass an increase in pay, much to his chagrin.

An interesting episode in American diplomatic history is the visit of the Pope's nunzio, Monsignor Bedini, to the United States in 1853. On March 20, 1853, Cass forwarded to the Department of State a letter from Cardinal Antonelli notifying the United States Government of the intended visit. "The Cardinal Secretary of State", wrote Antonelli, "would feel gratified if the Chargé d'Affaires of the United States would apprise, in advance, his government of the intended visit of Monsignor Bedini, in order to insure for him a cordial welcome, the more especially as he is the bearer of a letter from His Holiness."


24. On Dec. 7, 1851, Cass had written the Secretary of State: "The expenses incident to my residence at Rome in my official character consume my official receipts. My salary, indeed, is inadequate to support the style of living required by the station I occupy. ... The necessaries of life, and most of the articles of consumption, are very dear, while wages, house-rent, carriage-hire, and, in particular, fuel and lights, are enormously high. For the apartments I occupy ... I pay $1700, per annum. The fund allowed for the contingent expenses of this Legation, is insufficient for that purpose". No. 48, Cass to Webster, Dec. 7, 1851, Stock, U. S. Ministers, pp. 91-92.

The letter from His Holiness to the President expressed the Pope's good will and esteem toward the Government of the United States and commended especially the Catholics of the United States to the President's care. Cass regarded the mission as "a new and additional testimonial of the highly friendly and favorable sentiments entertained by Pius IX towards the Government and Institutions of the United States".

The chief purpose of Archbishop Bedini's visit to the United States was to investigate into the disputes over the title to church property between trustees and pastors. Arriving in the United States on June 30, he proceeded to Washington with Archbishop Hughes of New York and presented the autographed letter of the Pope to President Pierce and another to the secretary of state. His reception was cordial, and he was shown every consideration. Monsignor Bedini consulted some members of the cabinet concerning the appointment of a Papal nuncio to the United States, but Postmaster General James Campbell, a Catholic,


discouraged the idea.28 "In relation to the establishment of a nunciature to this country", wrote Campbell to Bodini, "the President will receive a charge, or minister from the Pope; but he can only, of course, be received as his political representative. If His Holiness were to appoint a layman, there would be no difficulty in receiving him in the same manner as the representative of every other sovereign power is now received, charged, of course, only with the public affairs of the Pontifical States."29

Although the reception of the Papal nuncio was cordial in the nation's capital, in the other cities he visited he met with such a display of animosity that when he left the United States he had the impression that the whole population was engaged in a plot against his life.30

Following the split in the Whig party over the slavery issue in 1850, the various abolitionist and anti-Catholic groups joined to form the Know-Nothing Party.31

28. Harraro, pp. 129-130. King reported that Cardinal Antonelli had said that there was no need of a Papal representative in the United States because the Papal Government "had nothing to ask from the United States, as in that country alone ... does there exist perfect freedom and equality in the matter of religion and the Catholic enjoys every right and privilege that is accorded to any citizen, whatever his creed, or condition". No. 20, King to Seward, Aug. 22, 1864, Stock, U. S. Ministers, pp. 315-316.


32. Channing, VI, pp. 130-142.
It was the members of this group which initiated the demonstrations against Bedini. Announcement that the government had accorded Monsignor Bedini the use of the U. S. S. "Michigan" on the Great Lakes kindled the flame of bigotry until Bedini was burned in effigy in almost every large city of the East. The fact that the nuncio was in America on business involving church property only added fuel to the flame, for this was regarded as Papal interference in the American right of private property. The attacks against Monsignor Bedini increased after Father Alessandro Cavazzi, an apostate priest and political exile from Italy, delivered a fiery lecture denouncing the Papal system, and in particular, accusing Bedini of atrocious crimes committed while he was Papal governor. Cavazzi accused Bedini of the cruel execution of Ugo Bassi, a chaplain in Garibaldi's army.

The first of a long series of insults occurred in Pittsburg on December 11, 1853, when a group of rowdies blew cigar smoke into the nuncio's face as he emerged from a church. In Cincinnati a group of young Germans, composing the "Society of Freemasons", who were reported to be planning to take Bedini's life, were set upon by the police. The group denied the charge, asserting that they only intended to protest the nuncio's presence by burning him in effigy. In New Orleans, prior to Bedini's arrival, placards were posted about the city inciting the populace against
him. 33 A revolutionary group in New York plotted to take
the nuncio's life but were frustrated when one of their own
group betrayed the plan, later paying with his life. 34
When the archbishop was leaving the United States, February
4, 1854, a large crowd, intent on insult and injury,
assembled at the quarantine station in New York where it
was supposed Bedini would embark. To avoid disturbance a
tug was chartered, which met Bedini at the Staten Island
landing, and conveyed him to the "Atlantic". A salute was
fired in the archbishop's honor as he embarked. Even
after the nuncio's departure anti-Bedini demonstrations
continued. 35

The insults offered Monsignor Bedini became the
subject of a discussion in the Senate on January 23, 1854. 36
Senator Cass, father of the minister to Rome, made a
resolution requesting that the State Department forward
information concerning the nature of Monsignor Bedini's
visit to the United States. A discussion ensued in which
all of the speakers, except Senator Waller of California

34. Feiertag, American Public Opinion on the Diplomatic
Relations between the United States and the Papal States, p. 76.
35. Marrero, p. 146.
condemned the outrages committed against the archbishop.

Appreciating the remarks made in the Senate on the insults offered him, Konsignor Bodini told William L. Marcy, secretary of state, that the American minister in Rome would be more popular than ever. "This promise", wrote Marcy to Pierce, "is due to a judicious speech made by General Cass, in the Senate, on the disturbances in Cincinnati and elsewhere. 37 Marcy immediately wrote Cass in Rome:

Should the occurrences to which I alluded be viewed in a light calculated to affect unfavorably the relations of this country with the Papal States, you will take an opportunity to assure its Minister of Foreign Affairs of the friendly reception given to the Archbishop by the President, and his regret that any part of the people should have forgotten in moments of excitement what was due to a distinguished functionary charged with a friendly mission from a foreign power with which this country has hitherto maintained, and is still desirous of maintaining, amicable relations. 38

Antonelli replied to Cass that he was certain the Government of the United States would eschew the actions against the nuncio. 39

On April 10, 1857, Cass communicated to the secretary of state his desire to retire from the mission. The resignation was accepted but Cass was requested to remain at his post until the new minister, Mr. John P. Stockton, arrived.

37. Quoted in Harraro, p. 145.


Cass presented his letter of recall on November 27, 1853, to the Pope, who received him "with great kindness," expressing appreciation for his conduct during his residence in Rome. In the meantime, John P. Stockton arrived in Rome on November 14. 40

Most of the activity of Cass's ministry took place in the first few years of his residence in Rome. fruitless negotiations were carried on to consummate a commercial treaty between the United States and the Papal States, but no significant development took place.


VII

THE MINISTRY OF JOHN P. STOCKTON

John P. Stockton had had no diplomatic experience. An ability to speak with suavity and a dignified manner were his chief qualifications for the post which his father's influence had won for him. He regarded his mission to Rome as one of the most important in Europe and regarded it a mistake to classify the Roman mission only in reference to commercial interests. "A proper regard to the politics of Europe", he wrote, "the dignity of our Country, the comfort and satisfaction of thousands of our citizens require that this mission should be placed on a different footing".¹

Soon after his arrival in Rome, Stockton presented his credentials to the Pope, who received him with the "usual kindness and cordiality", reciprocating Stockton's expression of good-will and welcoming him to Rome.¹

The year 1859 brought another attempt by the Sardinians to expel the Austrians from Italy. The Roman populace were excited and paraded through the streets, demanding the illumination of the buildings they passed and shouting, "Vive la Francia!" Passing by the American Legation, they

¹a. Ibid.
2. Stockton's father, Robert Stockton, was an outstanding naval officer who served in the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. Dictionary of American Biography.
shouted for its illumination, but Stockton refused to acquiesce, considering such conduct as unbecoming to a "representative of a neutral power." However, Stockton did not anticipate any disturbance which would affect the Papal authority. "I am satisfied," he wrote Cass, "that my prediction will be verified and that Rome will for some time to come remain tranquil, because the Emperor cannot strengthen the church party or ultramontanes by assisting their Union with the Legitimists, which would certainly do if the Pope were obliged to leave Rome for want of protection."  

During his ministry Stockton was called upon to defend the rights of American citizens on several occasions. In pursuance of its policy of not recognizing revolutionary governments, the Papal Government demanded that American citizens, before leaving the Papal States for Naples or other ports of the Two Sicilies, secure the visa of the consul of Francis II, although Francis was not the de facto ruler, and the de facto government did not require a consular visa for entrance into the country. In his protest

2. No. 6, Idem to Idem, June 8, 1859, Ibid., pp. 135-137.

3. The party in France who desired the restoration of the Bourbons.

to the Cardinal Secretary of State, Stockton upheld the thesis that "the refusal of permission to embark is a false imprisonment". In Stockton's opinion, if a traveller failed to secure a visa, it was his own fault and to his detriment. Since the de facto government of the Two Sicilies did not require a visa for entrance, Stockton could not see why American citizens had to pay $1.50 to secure one. He won his point, for a short time later he was informed by the Cardinal Secretary of State that the visa would no longer be required.5

While the Perkins family was travelling through the Papal States with the usual passports, they stopped at Perugia. There was no reason to anticipate any disturbance, but during their stay a peaceful revolution of the inhabitants occurred. About 5 P. M. on the 21st of June, the hotel in which they were staying was entered by a band of "brutal and savage soldiery". They sacked the building and killed the landlord and a servant. The Perkins family, terror stricken, sought refuge in a secret passage which led from their bedroom, remaining hidden for fourteen hours with the landlord's mother. A Papal soldier, discovering their hideaway, protected them from the other soldiers. The case was presented to Stockton, who immediately demanded of the Papal Government the arrest and punishment of the perpetrators and compensation.

---

for the losses sustained by Mr. Perkins and his family. The Cardinal Secretary of State, however, maintained that, since the action occurred during a revolution and the Perkins family was aware of their danger without taking precautions to seek safety, the Papal Government was blameless. Furthermore, the troops had been provoked to violence by firing and throwing of missiles from the hotel. In answer Stockton asserted that the Perkinses had no reason to believe that they were in danger from the Papal troops, since they possessed passports which pledged their security on the part of the Papal Government. They were not bound to apprehend danger from "intentional acts of the forces of the Government". Again Stockton won his case, and the Cardinal forwarded the amount demanded by Stockton in Roman gold. 6

On another occasion, the Papal soldiers, provoked by the hissing of passers-by, went on a rampage, wounding two American citizens. Glentworth, the American consul, in company with a French officer in full uniform, was approaching the door of the consulate when attacked by a Papal carabiniere with a drawn sword in his hand. Glentworth attributed the saving of his life to the interposition of his friend. On the same evening William Hall and Adam

Hill were walking along the Via del Corso, and hearing a commotion, glanced up to see three or four men running rapidly toward and past them. A troop of Papal gendarmes on horse and foot followed with swords drawn. Hearing the cry "In caso!", they stepped into the nearest doorway. Hall stepped out to seek a more secure refuge, and a gendarme on foot struck him on the shoulders with his sword. Hall declared they were Americans, to which the soldier replied, "Non importa", inflicting a wound on Hall's head.

The gendarme aimed a blow at Hill also but missed. Stockton again sought redress from the Cardinal Secretary of State, who deplored the act, declaring that "every effort should be made to seek out the individual who had attacked Mr. Glentworth". The Cardinal excused the soldiers on the ground that they were obliged, "in a military manner, to redress the insult offered them. It was difficult for the soldiers in the heat of conflict to distinguish one person from another. The Cardinal regarded the whole affair as "an inevitable consequence of an unfortunate circumstance, in which some innocent people were injured, as usually happens in similar cases". Stockton insisted that before attacking some warning should have been given by the soldiers for the benefit of the innocent. The Cardinal promised to ascertain the guilty soldiers and bring them to justice. In both of these episodes Stockton received the commendation of the
State Department for his judicious action. 7

Shortly before the end of his mission, Stockton was invited to attend a reception at the American College established by the Pope for Catholic Americans. He was ushered into a large room where the Pontiff was seated at a small table. Extending his hand, the Pope saluted Stockton "with much cordiality and kindness", saying, "I am most happy to meet you in America". "It always gives me sincere pleasure", replied Stockton graciously, "to salute Your Holiness, but more particularly here in the building which Your Holiness' liberality has devoted to the purpose of educating young Catholic Americans, and where among Americans, you feel yourself in America". 8

Pius motioned Stockton to take a seat beside him. After some preliminary speeches the Pontiff, himself, spoke "with much warmth and eloquence" in his native tongue. As he referred to the present condition of the Holy See, his eyes filled with tears. With "vehement utterance and violent gesticulation" he condemned the "ferocious enemies" of the Holy See, "who sought to rob her of the patrimony of


8. I have taken the liberty here of changing Stockton's indirect quotations into direct quotation, preserving carefully, however, the original sense, and, as far as possible, the exact words.
St. Peter's. "The political significance given to the speech", thought Stockton, "with the time and place chosen for the demonstration, makes the incidents above related, matters of history; and makes it my duty to detail to your Excellency, facts which otherwise would be of small importance". 9

In his despatch of November 18, 1860, Stockton recorded an interesting conversation with Cardinal Antonelli. The successes of the Sardinian forces in separating parts of the Pope's dominions from his authority led to a rumor that the Pontiff was contemplating a departure from Rome. Stockton consulted Antonelli concerning the truth of these statements. "It was my duty, Your Eminence," Stockton declared, "in writing to my government to say nothing on the subject until I found that the public journals were filled with such reports, after which I had written to the effect that, it had never been seriously a subject of consideration". This statement pleased the Cardinal and he began to converse freely for almost an hour.

What you have written is entirely correct. Up to this moment the departure of the Holy Father has not been seriously considered. The rumor to the contrary arose from this circumstance: when, after the entry of the Piedmontese into the Marches, the French General Goyon was sent back to Rome, he sought an audience with his Holiness. The General informed his Holiness that


10. I have rendered this conversation in direct quotation although in the despatch it is indirect quotation.
he had been sent back to protect the Holy Father from all danger, no matter from what quarter. His Holiness replied by urging upon him to advance his soldiers to Viterbo to support General de La Moriciere, to which General Goyon replied that he had no orders which would enable him to leave Rome. His Holiness then said that General Goyon had better not have come, that he was in no personal danger, that the only point where he asked assistance he refused to act and concluded with the hasty and indignant threat that unless the French supported him against Piedmont he would leave Rome. This hasty expression was repeated by General Goyon and led to the report you mentioned. However, although the Holy Father’s departure has not been seriously considered up to this time, circumstances might conceivably arise which might necessitate such an action. Suppose the French leave us and the Piedmontese come in to Rome.

"Your Eminence", replied Stockton, "has too much sagacity to believe that the Pope’s departure would be a good move. That is the crisis, that is the time to act, not to give up, that is the time to make terms with Victor Emmanuel". A smile of intelligence lighted the Cardinal’s face as he answered, "Make terms with the robbers who have despoiled us! What terms could we make with them!" "Your Eminence knows very well", Stockton countered, "that it is necessary to make terms with the devil sometimes. And while it is Your Eminence’s duty to be patient until the time comes, when it does come, I believe that terms can be made which under the circumstances will be the best course for the Holy Seat, and will be consistent with the liberal progress of political ideas. Many a warm Catholic in America is as warm an admirer of Garibaldi. Why did the Government of His Holiness not accept the presidency of the confederation
when it was proposed? 11 It was certainly the best course at the time." "His Holiness did accept", the Cardinal answered. "Yes, as an abstract proposition, but you allowed it to be defeated in details," declared Stockton. In the course of the conversation the Cardinal referred to America as "the only free country in the world" and predicted the final victory of republicanism in Italy. 12

On April 2, 1861, Stockton wrote Seward, the new secretary of state, requesting a letter of recall, which was promptly sent. Before his departure from Rome, he presented to the Cardinal Secretary of State an instruction, addressed to his successor, Rufus King, respecting the attitude of foreign powers toward the internal struggle in which the United States was engaged. The Cardinal gave the following reply: "The Catholics of the United States as Catholics, as a church, would take no part in the matter, it would not be proper for them to do so, as citizens . . . they would all feel great concern at our internal dissensions (sic) . . . You are aware that the government of his Holiness concerns itself mainly, in spiritual matters, but we are

11. A confederacy of the Italian states under the presidency of the Pope was one of the proposals for uniting Italy.

the supporters of law and order everywhere.  "13

Stockton's ministry saw no significant development in the relations between the United States and the Papal States. The customary cordiality and good feeling were maintained. The Papal authorities seemed more than willing to please the United States Government, as is evidenced by the action taken in the incidents involving American citizens. The close of Stockton's ministry was marked by the outbreak of the Civil War in the United States, an event which was destined to leave its mark on the diplomatic relations between the two countries.

---

After Stockton's resignation, Rufus King, an intimate friend of Seward, was appointed as minister to Rome. However, the outbreak of the Civil War changed King's plans and he resigned his new post to accept an appointment as brigadier-general in the Union army.¹ At King's suggestion, A. W. Randall, former governor of Wisconsin, was appointed to the post. Like Stockton, Randall had had no training or experience in diplomacy, and was humble enough to admit that he possessed none of the qualities desirable in a diplomat.

Taking some time to settle his private affairs, Randall did not arrive in Rome until ten months after his appointment.² On Jan. 6, 1862, Randall was given his first

1. Rufus King to Abraham Lincoln, Aug. 6, 1861, Ibid., p. 259.

2. Soon after his appointment he requested a short leave in order to close up the state war accounts and assist in organizing two additional regiments of Wisconsin soldiers for war service. Randall to Seward, Aug. 7, 1861, Stock, U. S. Ministers, p. 240. The death Governor Harvey of Wisconsin occasioned further delay, and Randall explained to Seward: "Mr. Harvey and myself are the only persons perfectly familiar with our war acts, and with what had been done by my Private Secy. and it became necessary for me to communicate with our state before I left." Idem to Idem, April 25, 1862, Ibid., p. 245. "Our sending a minister to Rome," declared Seward, "was just as meaningless as our consenting to Mr. Mercier's going to Richmond. We appointed Rufus King sixteen
audience with the Supreme Pontiff. Introduced to the
Pontiff by Dr. Smith, professor of Dogmatic Theology at the
College of the Propaganda, who acted as his interpreter. Randall began his address: "If the Holy Father please:
I have been sent as Minister Resident of the United States
of America at Rome, and I come now, to present to the
Holy Father my credentials, and with them, the greeting of
the President of the United States, with the assurance,
that towards Your Holiness, and towards your Government,
the President entertains sentiments of respect and great
good will." Mentioning the non-interference of the United
States in the internal affairs of the Papal States,
Randall requested the same attitude from the Holy See
toward the United States in civil war. He then attempted
to correct any misapprehensions the Holy Father might have
in regard to the nature of that war:

It is not resistance, by the South to oppression,
for there has been no oppression by the Government, its
officers or agents. It is not a struggle, by the
South, for rights; for every right guaranteed by the

months ago. He declined. We appointed Mr. Randall a year
ago. He waited until he got the Wisconsin forces into the
field and then went to Rome to save the appointment." Seward to Bigelow, June 25, 1862, Ibid., p. 240n.

3. Stillman, American consul in Rome, remarked that
the only language Randall knew was western American and that
he knew nothing of diplomacy or good manners. Stillman,
constitution, or ever enjoyed, since the Government began, was protected and enjoyed, by aid under the laws, at the commencement of this war. It is not a war of the North against the South, nor a war waged, by one portion of the country to subjugate or conquer another portion of the country. It is a war of principles. It is treason, and rebellion, on the one hand, and law, order, and constitutional Government on the other.

... This causeless, inexcusable, wicked rebellion will be crushed, --ground as between an upper and nether Millstone.

Randall then proceeded to commend the loyalty of the Catholic clergy in the United States. Concluding in a burst of eloquence, Randall declared: "And here, in Rome, --old Rome, yet new, --new Rome, yet old, where Empires have been founded, where sleep the bones of Martyrs, and where Christianity hath wept over the slain of her people, the Holy Father may still sit, telling the nations by his precepts, that God must reign everywhere, as in the humble cottage, so, in the palaces of Princes and in the Courts of Kings(1)"

In reply the Holy Father expressed his gratitude for the friendly sentiments and sympathy, for the desires expressed for the preservation of the temporal power, "which has endured so many ages (and will still endure notwithstanding all the efforts of the enemies of religion)". He approved the condition of the Church in the United States and continued: "And We may take this opportunity of stating that what it asks is not favor or state protection but its own natural freedom and indefeasible
right to maintain its existence, to secure its independence with a view to the good of religion and the true interests of society." He concluded: "As Vice-Sorent on earth of the God of peace, we cannot but profoundly deplore the present state of things in the United States and from our heart we implore that same God of peace to put an end to the unhappy strife for the welfare both of the United States and of Europe. And humbly and fervently do we implore the blessing of the Most High on that great country and its rulers."

As soon as he undertook his duties, Randall felt a sense of inadequacy. "I have felt from the beginning ... that I am unfit for a diplomatic position", he wrote Seward. His lack of knowledge of languages made him feel that he was being imposed upon. He felt that Cardinal Antonelli really understood English, though he expressed himself through an interpreter. He distrusted Dr. Smith, his own interpreter. In recording the Pope's reply to Randall's address, Smith had crossed out the words concerning the temporal power: "and will still endure notwithstanding all the efforts of the enemies of religion". "The two lines struck out in the reply", wrote Randall, "contain what was actually said; but for reasons of his own, Dr. Smith drew his pen across them. I think both my remarks and the reply

---

have suffered, some, in the translation, from the fact, that
in the reply, I am assumed to have said, what is not
warranted by my address."5

Randall's first diplomatic experiences apparently
turned him against any thought of a career in the foreign
service. Only five days after his audience with the Pope,
Randall asked for his recall:

Mr. Seward will excuse me for saying that while
I would like to be of service to our Government, it will
be seen already that such a position as this I am not
fitted for. I am unused to the formalities and
ceremonies of Courts. They are distasteful to me. I
neither understand the Italian, French, or German. I
am liable therefore to be imposed upon.

I can only ask that if you are now satisfied as
I am that I can be of no service here, or that I may
be injudicious in my intercourse with this Govt. I may
be relieved and my resignation accepted.

I shall be governed by your decision, but I feel
that I am not fitted for such a position, at such a
time.6

Seward accepted the resignation, and Randall returned home
in August of 1862. After Randall's departure, Stillman
performed the duties of the legation.7

Blatchford was notified on August 11, 1862, of his
appointment to the Roman mission, and a few days later he
sent in his acceptance.8 Like his predecessor, Blatchford

5. Ibid., p. 248-250.
6. Randall to Seward, June 11, 1862, Ibid., pp. 245-246.
8. Idem to Idem, August 11, 1862, Ibid., p. 258.
had very few qualifications for a diplomatic position, outside of the fact that he was a friend of Seward. He was a man of spotless integrity, high ideals, and devotion to the public service. He had been a school teacher, had practiced law in New York, had acted as counsel and financial agent of the Bank of England in the United States and later for the Bank of the United States. He had served one term in the New York Assembly. 9

After considerable delay in reaching his post, 10 he arrived in Rome on November 16, 1862. In his instructions to Blatchford, Seward stated the reason for the Roman mission:

This Government has not now, it seldom has had, any special transaction, either commercial or political, to engage the attention of a Minister at Rome.

It is believed that ever since the tide of emigration set in upon this continent the head of the Roman Church and States has freely recognized and favored the development of the principle of political freedom on the part of the Catholics in this country, while he has never lost an opportunity to express his satisfaction with the growth, prosperity, and progress of the American people. It was under these circumstances that this Government, in 1848, wisely determined that while it maintained representatives in the capitals of every other civilized State, and even at the capitals of many semi-civilized States which reject the whole Christian religion, it was neither wise nor necessary to exclude Rome from the circle of our diplomatic intercourse. Thus far the new relation then established has proved pleasant and beneficial.


10. He was detained in London by gales on the Channel, his wife's illness delayed him 9 days in Paris, and an avalanche in the Appenines delayed him another 3 days at Bologna. No. 4, Blatchford to Seward, Feb. 14, 1863, Stock, U. S. Ministers, pp. 269-270.
Seward gave Blatchford specific instructions in regard to the attitude he was to take toward the temporal power. He was to remain absolutely neutral in that question for three reasons: (1) as far as it was an ecclesiastical question, it was outside the scope of American concern—"for you are a political representative only"; (2) as far as it affected the Roman States, it was a purely internal question; and (3) as a political question it concerned Europe only. In concluding his instructions, Seward urged Blatchford to advance the Union cause in the Civil War.\textsuperscript{11}

Accompanied by Stillman and Hooker, an American resident whom he had appointed secretary of the legation, Blatchford had his first audience with the Pontiff on November 26, 1862, at midday. After the usual exchange of civilities, the Holy Father referred to the Civil War in America. He suggested that the mediation of some lesser power might be advantageous. Concerning the conversation Blatchford wrote:

He said, it is evident that 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 no interest in diminishing the Power of the United States, having neither army nor Navy, and whose Very humbleness may make the offer of her service acceptable—he said also that he had only a few battalions of

\textsuperscript{11} No. 2, Seward to Blatchford, Sept. 27, 1862, \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 253-260.
soldiers, no Navy except a single corvette\textsuperscript{12}... but now all his states on the Adriatic are taken away and even the corvette is useless.

Here his Holiness changed the subject (not caring probably, as it struck me, to say anything as to an offer of his own mediation.)

At the conclusion of the audience, Pius offered his hand to Blatchford. "I ask the blessing of God on your government and country, and desire that peace may return to it", the Pope said. After the audience with the Pope, Blatchford paid his respects to the Cardinal Secretary of State Antonelli, who, he reported, declared: "If I had the honor to be an American Citizen I would do everything in my power to preserve the strength of the Nation undivided".\textsuperscript{13}

In March of 1863, Blatchford was granted a leave of absence.\textsuperscript{14} In London he met William Ewart, who had been sent to England to stop the building of Confederate vessels. Blatchford wrote to Seward: "I think I shall run home for a month with Ewart in July".\textsuperscript{15} After his arrival in the

\textsuperscript{12} This was the "Immaculate Conception". The Pope often made jesting remarks about his one-ship navy.

\textsuperscript{13} No. 1, Blatchford to Seward, Nov. 29, 1862, \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 261-26. Cardinal Antonelli declared to Stillman, American consul in Rome: "There is but one course for your government to pursue—to carry on the war to its utmost ability... It could only act as it had acted; you can only treat with the South on submission. It is a pity, but there is no other consistent or possible course." Stillman to Seward, Sept. 16, 1862, Stock, \textit{Consular Relations}.

\textsuperscript{14} No. 12, Seward to Blatchford, Mar. 9, 1863, \textit{Ibid.}, p. 274.

\textsuperscript{15} Blatchford to Seward, May 20, 1863, \textit{Ibid.}, p. 277.
United States, he asked leave to resign, because "circumstances beyond my control make it necessary for me to do so". 16

IX

MANN'S MISSION TO ROME

The Civil War was now in full swing, and the diplomats of both the North and the South were active, attempting to secure, if not the open support, at least the neutrality of the powers of Europe. The Federal Government had its agents abroad, enlisting foreign laborers to come to the United States in order to make up for the depletion of labor caused by the conflict and to augment the Union troops. A circular was sent out by Seward in which the opportunities America offered in high wages and good living were presented in glowing terms, with the result that in Paris there was "a perfect rush" to the American legation. "The exhaustive character of the struggle", wrote Dayton from Paris, "seems to call for some such remedy to supply the depletion; and you may rest assured that nothing will tend so much and so promptly to that end as cheapening the price of passage. If to this could be added the certainty, upon their arrival, of immediate employment, the gap in our population created by the war and its incidents would be more than filled up by the current immigration." G. Owley estimates that, as a

a result of this policy, "between 400,000 and 500,000
mercenary troops, the bulk of whom were from impoverished
Catholic countries, were by force of bounties and trickery
induced into the American army." 2

This policy of the Federal Government naturally
angered the Confederates. Mann, the Confederate envoy,
wrote to his secretary of state:

The Washington Cabinet has connived at the
commission of deeds . . . which excited humane civil-
ization to blush for the depravity of that well-nigh
fiendish concern. . . . It has displayed its perfidy
so strikingly that it is palpable to the humblest laborer. It may win battles with the aid of the
recruits which it has so fraudulently obtained on
this side of the Atlantic, but it can never more
enjoy honor in the opinion of the just minded."3

Mann even declared that "all the houses of correction and
poor houses have been drained." 4

But the Confederate Government did not sit idly
by while the Union armies were augmented with recruits from
Europe. Agents were sent to Europe, particularly to
Ireland, to counteract the Union activity. A. Dudley
Mann was selected to repair to Rome and there to obtain

2. Frank Lawrence Owsley, King Cotton Diplomacy, p. 519.
3. No. 110, Mann to Benjamin, Oct. 12, 1864,
Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in
the War of the Rebellion, (hereafter cited as O. R.),
Series 2, III, p. 1223.
4. No. 103, Idem to idem, Aug. 20, 1864, O. R.,
Ser. 2, III, p. 1168.
the Pope's influence in preventing the enlistment of Catholic aliens in the Northern army.\textsuperscript{5} Ostensibly Mann's mission to Rome was to convey a letter of thanks from President Davis to the Pope for a letter the Pope had written to the archbishops of New York and New Orleans, urging the use of their influence to bring about peace.

The Confederates chose an opportune time to send Mann to Rome, for from Blatchford's departure in July of 1863 until King's arrival in Rome on December 23, 1863, the Union Government had no minister in Rome.\textsuperscript{6} Mann arrived in the Eternal City on November 9. Two days later he obtained an interview with Cardinal Antonelli, in which he explained the object of his mission and was assured an audience with the Pope. Antonelli expressed admiration at the powers of resistance displayed by the South in a war which had been prosecuted with an energy, aided by the employment of all the recent improvements in the

\textsuperscript{5} It was hoped that the Pope would use his influence with such Catholic sovereigns as Leopold of Belgium and Napoleon III of France. Gwale, p. 520.

\textsuperscript{6} A later request of Mr. King for a leave of absence w.\textsuperscript{s} denied by the State Department on the ground that "insurgent agents would, in all likelihood, take advantage of your absence, as they did in the case of Mr. Blatchford, to steal into Rome for the purpose of getting up intrigues". No. 9. Seward to King, April 18, 1864, \textit{S. T. F. Ministers}, pp. 291-292.
instruments of destruction of life and property, unparalleled, perhaps, in the world's history". The Cardinal proclaimed Jefferson Davis one of the greatest statesmen of modern times. He then expressed the urgent desire of the Holy See for peace. Mann did not waste any time in bringing the recruiting practices of the North to the Cardinal's attention. "Christianity had cause to weep at such a fiendish destruction of life as occurred from the beguiling of those people from their homes to take up arms against citizens who had never harmed or wronged them in the slightest degree", declared Mann. The Cardinal manifested emotion and intimated that "an evil so disgraceful to humanity was not beyond the reach of a salutary remedy".  

At noon on November 14, Mann set out with his private secretary to the Vatican for his audience with the Holy Father. The Pope mentioned the letters he had written to the archbishops of New York and New Orleans, remarking that the reply of the former did not extend much hope. Mann then delivered President Davis' letter. Glancing a moment at the address and seal on the letter, the Pope took a scissors and, cutting the envelope, remarked, "I see it is in English, a language which I do not understand". "If it

will be agreeable to your Holiness, my secretary will translate its contents to you", replied Mann. "I shall be pleased if he will do so." The secretary then proceeded to read Davis' letter in a slow, solemn, and emphatic tone. A sweet look of benignity and pious affection came over the Pope's countenance. At the end of each sentence he laid his hand down on the desk, bowing his head approvingly. When the secretary read the lines, "We have offered up at the footstool of our Father . . . prayers inspired by the same feeling which animated your Holiness", tears came to his eyes and he raised them heavenward, "indicating", Mann declares, "that his heart was pleading for our deliverance". After a moment's silence the Holy Father said, "Lincoln and Company have tried to create the impression abroad that they were fighting for the abolition of slavery. It might be judicious on your part to consent to a gradual emancipation." "Your Holiness", replied Mann, "only the states have power over this. True philanthropy shudders at the thought of a liberation of the slave in the manner attempted by Lincoln and Company. Such a procedure would practically convert a well-cared-for negro into a semi- barbarian."

"I should like", declared the Pope, "to do anything that can be effectively done or that even promises good results, to aid in putting an end to this most terrible war
which is harming the good of all the earth, if I knew how to proceed".

Here was Mann's opportunity to present his case. He explained to the Holy Father the system of foreign recruiting employed by the North, omitting no details that might shock the Holy Father's sensibilities. "But, your Holiness", continued Mann, "Lincoln and Company are even more wicked, if possible, in their ways, than in decoying innocent Irishmen from their homes to be murdered in cold blood.

Their champions, and would your Holiness believe it, unless it were authoritatively communicated to you—-their pulpit champions have boldly asserted this as a sentiment: 'Greeks fire for the families and cities of the rebels, and Hell-fire for their chiefs!'"

The Pope was duly shocked. "I will write a letter", he declared, "to President Davis and of such a character that it may be published for general perusal". This was the origin of the famous letter of the Pope to President Davis, which provoked so much controversy.

Mann was deeply impressed by the kind reception he received from the Holy Father and his secretary of state. At the close of his despatch he wrote:

How strikingly majestic the conduct of the government of the Pontifical States in its bearing toward me when contrasted with the sneaking subterfuges to which some of the governments of western Europe have had recourse in order to evade intercourse with our commissioners. Here I was openly received by appointment
at court in accordance with established usages and
customs and treated from beginning to end with a
consideration which might be envied by the envoy of the
oldest member of the family of nations.8

On the 19th of November, Mann had a second inter-
view with Cardinal Antonelli. During the audience the
Cardinal frequently took Mann's hand in his own and exclaimed,
"Mon cher, your Government has accomplished prodigies, alike
in the cabinet and in the field". The other foreign
ministers were kept waiting some time that the interview
might not be disturbed. "We have been virtually, if not
practically, recognized here", exclaimed Mann.9

The Pope's letter was transmitted to Mann on
December 8. Written in Latin, it was addressed, "To the
Illustrious and Honorable Jefferson Davis, President of
the Confederate States of America". The letter was general
in nature. Referring to the North, the Pope said:

"Could to God that the other inhabitants of these
regions, and their rulers, seriously reflecting upon
the fearful and mournful nature of intestine warfare,
might, in a dispassionate mood, hearken to and adopt
the counsels of peace! . . . We also pray the same
All-clement Lord of Mercies to cause to shine upon
Your Excellency the Light of his Divine Grace and to

8. No. 67, Mann to Benjamin, Nov. 16, 1863, O. R.,
Ser. 2, III, pp. 952-955. This despatch gives a detailed
account of the entire audience with the Pope.

9. No. 68, Idem to Idem, Nov. 21, 1863, O. R., Ser. 2,
III, pp. 963-964.
unite you and ourselves in bonds of perfect love. 10

It was in this address that some attempted to make a case for Papal recognition of the Confederacy.

Mann saw in it a "positive recognition of our government". "I congratulate you, I congratulate the President, I congratulate the Cabinet; in short", he declared breathlessly, "I congratulate all my true-hearted countrymen and country women, upon this benign event". Not wishing to risk its capture, Mann determined to carry the letter on his own person. "It will adorn the archives of our country in all coming time", he exclaimed.

Judah P. Benjamin, the Confederate Secretary of State, was not so enthusiastic. In his reply to Mann he wrote:

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 their delusion that these States still remain members of the old Union . . . his address to the President

10. Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, XIV, p. 270. The Pope later expressed an ardent hope that Davis' life might be spared. No. 42, King to Seward, June 24, 1865, Stock, U. S. Ministers, pp. 341-362. During Davis' imprisonment the Holy Father sent him an autographed picture of himself with the words, "Come unto me, all ye who are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest", written beneath. Mrs. Davis, Jefferson Davis, Ex-President of the Confederate States of America, A Memoir, II, p. 448.

as "President of the Confederate States" is a formula of politeness to his correspondent, not a political recognition of a fact. 12

Mann was optimistic concerning the letter's effect on the foreign recruiting policy of the Union. He wrote enthusiastically to Benjamin:

The influence that the measure is to exercise in our behalf is incalculable. It is believed that the earnest wishes expressed by His Holiness will be regarded as little less than imperative commands by that vast portion of the human family which esteem him as the Vicar of Christ.

If that shall be the case, then the war spirit of Lincoln and Co. will receive a scorching that will so enfeeble it as to utterly impair its power for persistence. I have an abiding confidence in such a result. 13

Mann claimed that, as a result of Pio Nono's letter to Davis, already the recruits to the Northern armies had diminished. 14 However, Mann's hopes were not entirely borne out. The Catholic Church did use influence to prevent the enlistment of foreign Catholics in the Northern armies, but there was no apparent decrease in the enlistments. Nevertheless, there may have been an increase, if Mann had not intervened. 15

15. Owsley, p. 526.
While there was no diplomatic representative of the Union in Rome during the time of Mann's visit, the Union cause was not entirely unrepresented. H. C. Hooker, the secretary of the legation, was active in countering Confederate influence. Inviting Father Smith of the Propaganda to dine, Hooker was assured that "the Government here would not change its position regarding our country". "It is said", wrote Hooker to Seward, "that The Pope told Mr. Mann to come to him whenever he liked; however, I do not see that any umbrage can be taken at this though one would have been better pleased otherwise. The Pope, however, gives audiences very freely to the world in general." 16 Hooker explained to Cardinal Antonelli the Northern viewpoint on the slavery question:

The Cardinal said Mr. Mann had told him, the South was willing to do away with slavery but by slow degrees. That if the South emancipated them at once, a war of races would commence. I told him this slow emancipation view was a new one in the South; that all the principal leaders of the Rebellion held slavery to be the corner stone of their existence, and that I could show him speeches of all of them to this effect, and that Mr. Mann, was trying to set up sympathy (sic) for his cause; The Cardinal said he was aware of it, and has evidently not taken much to heart what Mr. Mann said.17


Hooper mentioned a Kentucky priest who had been writing a series of articles in the _Osservatore Romano_, claiming that the Northern leaders favored Garibaldi, Kossuth, and other radicals all over the world, and that the Confederates had the support of the conservative groups in Europe. "I endeavor to counteract this influence all I can", Hooper declared. 18

Although the Papal authorities were considerate toward the Confederate envoy, there is no evidence that their action went any further than this, or that the fundamental attitude of the Holy See was altered. 19 Cardinal Antonelli was a great exponent of the idea of gradual emancipation and mentioned it on more than one occasion to the United States minister. On the whole, the Papal Government maintained a rather impartial attitude.

---

18. Idem to idem, Nov. 21, 1865, Ibid., p. 301.
19. Cardinal Antonelli had not demanded that Southerners visiting in Rome secure the American consul's visa on their passports on the ground that it was a violation of the rights of conscience. No. 63, Mann to Benjamin, Nov. 21, 1865, O. R., Ser. 2, III, pp. 965-964.
X.

RUFUS KING, LAST MINISTER TO ROME

Like Randall and Blatchford, King had no diplomatic experience to qualify him for his position. He had engaged in engineering, newspaper work, education, and politics. A graduate of West Point, his chief interest seems to have been in military affairs. During his service in the Union army, he organized the "Iron Brigade". He served in the army until October, 1863, when he resigned because of ill health.¹ Seward reappointed him minister at Rome on October 15, 1865.²

After a "tempestuous and somewhat protracted" voyage, King arrived in Rome on the 23rd of December, 1863. He immediately commenced to counteract any influence the Confederate envoy Mann may have had upon the Holy See. In an audience with Cardinal Antonelli, the Cardinal mentioned to King that he had read the American constitution and could see that the Southern states sought an "unconstitutional remedy" for their grievances and "were endeavouring to dissolve by force a Union consecrated by law".

¹ King suffered from epilepsy.  Dictionary of American Biography.
² Seward to King, Oct. 15, 1863, Stock, U. S. Ministers, p. 278.
Expressing the opinion that a gradual emancipation of slaves was preferable, he stated that he had been "repeatedly assured by Southern gentlemen that they too, desired to abolish Slavery; but that while they thought it necessary, as a preliminary step, to educate the slaves for Freedom and to bestow that boon upon them as fast as they were fit for it, the North desired to precipitate matters and to emancipate, at a blow, all the slaves of the South, despite the risk of an internecine war of the races". King explained that Mann's sentiments were not those of the Southern leaders and were said no doubt, "in deference to the existing sentiment in Europe".

On the 8th of January, King was accorded an audience with the Pontiff. With his usual affability, Pius inquired about the President's health and "then passed to the subject of America". King called the Pope's attention to the American policy of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other nations. The Pope replied that he had "nothing to complain of, on the part of America--nothing, nothing." "As to intervening in your affairs", added the Holy Father, "I have no weapon left but this pen". King was convinced

3. No. 20, King to Seward, August 22, 1864, Ibid., p. 316.

that the Pope was sincere in his desire to see the United States at peace. 5

Seward instructed King to obtain from the Pontifical Government a statement concerning the true significance of the letter of the Pope to Jefferson Davis. It was Seward's opinion that the letter was "free from all political design and ... intended merely as an expression of the good wishes of the Holy Father for the restoration of peace to the people of the United States". 6 This opinion was corroborated by the Cardinal in an interview with King; Antonelli declared the letter "a simple act of courtesy and devoid of any political design, or significance". 7 Seward wrote: "The explanations of Cardinal Antonelli are regarded as frank and friendly, and have given much satisfaction". 8

A report from "a gentleman of high standing in Canada" that there existed a parchment which purported to be a recognition of the Confederacy by the Pope gave some anxiety to the State Department, but in an interview with King the Cardinal denied the report "without a moment's


6. No. 4, Seward to King, Feb 9, 1864, Stock, U. S. Ministers, p. 235.

7. No. 6, King to Seward, Mar. 19, 1864, Ibid., p. 288.

8. No. 7, Seward to King, April 6, 1864, Ibid., p. 290.
hesitation and in the frankest manner. 9

The presence of two Confederate agents in Rome during 1864 gave King some concern. Bishop Lynch of North Carolina had been appointed by Jefferson Davis as "special commissioner of the Confederate States of America to the States of the Church". 10 He was instructed to press for the recognition of the Confederacy. In a despatch to Seward, King mentions the Bishop's presence in Rome. "He has not, however", King added, "met with any official recognition from the Papal Authorities, nor from what I can learn is he likely to do so." 11 King was assured by Antonelli that Lynch had never been recognized as a representative of Jefferson Davis and that "like every other good Catholic, resident in the United States, it was his bounden duty to honor, respect and obey the constituted authorities of the Government, under whose protection he lived". 12 After the war Lynch desired to return to the United States, but, fearing that criminal proceedings might betaken against him, he applied to King to discover under

11. No. 19, King to Seward, July 30, 1864, Stock, U. S. Ministers, p. 313.
what conditions he would be allowed to return. "I judge that he is effectually cured of his Secession folly," concluded King.

James T. Scudder was sent to Rome by the Confederate commissioners in Europe, carrying a message to be delivered to the Pontifical Government. Scudder in his despatch to Slidell states that he received a very cordial welcome from Cardinal Antonelli. The Cardinal, Scudder declared, made no secret of his sympathy for the Confederate cause. "I cannot detail everything," wrote Scudder, "that dropped from his Eminence during my interview, which lasted half an hour, but I was more than gratified with the great interest he manifested in the cause dear to our hearts."

The Cardinal gave a very general reply to the letter of the commissioners to the great disappointment of Scudder. He expressed only a desire for peace. John Slidell wrote Benjamin: "I have received the answer of the holy see to the joint note of 11th November. . . . As I find it less decided in its tone than the letter of 5d December last of his Holiness to the President, I do not think it expedient to publish and have so said to Messrs. Mason and Mann."

---


On April 18, 1864, the Archduke Maximilian and his wife, Carlotta, stopped in Rome on their way to Mexico, where they were to become rulers of the puppet empire set up by Napoleon III. During their stay, M. d'Estrada, chairman of the deputation which offered Maximilian the crown of Mexico, "by command of the Emperor and Empress of Mexico" invited the diplomatic corps, the cardinals, and Roman nobility to a reception in their Majesties' honor. Knowing the American attitude toward the French interference in Mexico, King was undecided whether to attend the reception or not. On the afternoon before the reception he decided in the negative.15 But King was unable to resist the temptation to attend such a glittering social function, particularly when all his colleagues of the diplomatic corps were to be present.16 During the course of the evening

15. Leo F. Stock, "The Empress of Mexico Visits Rome", America, XXXVII, No. 10 (June 18, 1927), pp. 226-227. A young American, Robert Seton, later archbishop, attending the Accademia Eclesiastica dei Nobili, refused to attend the reception, even under threat of dismissal. "Monsignor", he said to his superior, "I mean no disrespect, but my country is opposed to the setting up of this Empire." When the incident was mentioned to the Pope, the Holy Father replied, "He is my only American. He shall remain". Ibid., p. 227.

16. King wrote to Seward: "In view of the facts that all the Members of the Diplomatic Corps, now present in Rome, proposed to unite in paying, unofficially however, this visit of courtesy to the Austrian Prince, and that he had been formally received by the Government to which I was myself accredited, I decided to accept M. d'Estrada's invitation". No. 9, King to Seward, Apr. 23, 1864, Stock, U.S. Ministers, pp. 292-293.
King met the Archduke, who cordially inquired about President Lincoln's health and the latest news from America. The American minister drew an accurate picture of him and his wife:

He is an accomplished gentleman, conversing fluently in French, Italian, and English; but he does not strike me as possessing sufficient force of character, or strength of intellect to deal successfully with the difficult questions with which he will find his Mexican throne surrounded. The Archduchess is a lady of great personal attractions, varied accomplishments, and winning address.

Shortly after leaving the Archduke, King met the French ambassador, Count Sartiges, who did not lose the opportunity to justify the French protectorate in Mexico to the American minister. The Count declared:

Mexico under a stable government and settled rule will become not only one of the richest and most productive countries in the world, but the very best customer the United States can have; and as for our protectorate, we shall be only too glad to withdraw entirely from there, the moment that Maximilian, accepted by the people of Mexico, assumes the crown and enters upon the discharge of his Imperial duties.

King exchanged the customary official courtesies with the diplomatic representative sent by Maximilian to the Papal court. 17

If King thought that his action on this occasion might avoid the disapproval of the State Department, he was corrected. Seward immediately addressed to him a reprimand:

---

17. No. 9, King to Seward, April 23, 1864, Stock, U. S. Ministers, pp. 292-293.
I regret to learn . . . that you thought it not improper to join the Diplomatic society of Rome in paying ceremonial courtesies to the Archduke Maximilian under the designation of Emperor of Mexico and also to the person whom he had named as Minister at Rome . . . The President excuses the error on your part because you were unfortunately left without instructions. You will, of course, quietly discontinue official relations with the representative of the Arch Duke at Rome, and will be expected to bear in mind hereafter that you can know no Government of any State but the one which is recognized by this Department, and that only agents of governments which are acknowledged here can be treated by you as representatives of foreign powers. It is hardly necessary to inform you that the United States do not hastily abandon old friends, although they may be unfortunate, nor is it conformable with their habits to acknowledge new revolutionary powers. 18

King was quick to send his regrets for his error and promised to "take care to correct, in some proper way, any false impression, as to the position of the American Government on this question, which my action may possibly have created". 19 When Maximilian's ambassador visited him, King politely informed him that he was not free to enter into relations with the representative of a government unrecognized by the United States. 20

19. No. . . , King to Seward, June 10, 1864, Ibid., pp. 304-305.
20. No. 17, Ibid to Ibid, July 16, 1864, Ibid., pp. 311-312. J. C. Hooker records part of the tragic end of this Mexican venture in a letter to Seward, Oct. 18, 1866. "One morning," wrote Hooker, "He [the Pope] was surprised by her [Carlotta] appearing at the Vatican at a very early hour demanding his protection she saying that those around her
If King merited condemnation for his action in the Maximilian incident, for his action in apprehending the criminal, John H. Surratt, he received the highest commendation from the State Department. John Surratt was involved in the conspiracy to assassinate Lincoln. His mother's home in Washington had been the rendezvous for the conspirators. After Lincoln's assassination, Surratt fled to Canada, whence he went to England, then to Italy, finally enlisting in the Papal Zouaves. H. B. Ste. Marie, a member of the same company as Surratt, who had known him earlier in America,21 recognized him. Having obtained incriminating evidence from Surratt while "a little tight", Ste. Marie informed King of Surratt's presence in the Papal army.

"Darn the Yankee", Ste. Marie reported him to have said, "they killed my mother;22 but I have done them as much harm as I could. We have killed Lincoln, the nigger's friend", wished to poison her—and showing that her mind was affected.

Her Brother the Duke de Flanders was telegraphed for, and came, and has taken her away she refusing to see any of the Mexicans who accompanied her". Ibid., pp. 383-386.


It was Mr. Marie's desire to return to the United States to testify against Surratt.\(^\text{23}\)

When King spoke to Cardinal Antonelli about the matter, the Cardinal manifested great interest and "intimated that if the American Government desired the surrender of the criminal there would probably be no difficulty in the way".\(^\text{24}\)

In a later interview the Cardinal expressed his explicit willingness to cooperate in the apprehension of Surratt.

Without awaiting further orders from the American minister, the Cardinal had Surratt arrested and imprisoned.\(^\text{25}\)

\(^{23}\) No. 59, King to Seward, July 14, 1866, Stock, U. S. Ministers, pp. 370-372.

\(^{24}\) No. 62, Idem to idem, Aug. 8, 1866, Ibid., pp. 377-378. Cardinal Antonelli declared to King "that there was, indeed, no extradition treaty between the two countries and that to surrender a criminal where capital punishment was likely to ensue was not exactly in accordance with the spirit of the Papal Government; but that in so grave and exceptional a case and with the understanding that the United States Government, under parallel circumstances would do as they desired to be done by, he thought the request of the State Department for the surrender of Surratt, would be granted". No. 65, Idem to idem, Nov. 2, 1866, Ibid., pp. 385-387.

\(^{25}\) Concerning this action of the Papal Government, King wrote: "Some surprise, perhaps, may be expressed that Surratt was arrested by the Papal authorities before any request to that effect had been made by the American Government. This was alluded to in a conversation I had on the subject with Cardinal Antonelli and the Minister of War, on Friday last. Both gave me to understand that the arrest was made, with the approval of his Holiness and in anticipation of any application from the State Department, as well for the purpose of placing Surratt in safe custody, as with the view to show the disposition of the Papal Government to comply with the expected request of the American authorities. I have no reason to doubt the entire good faith of the Papal Government in the matter. No. 67, Idem to idem, Nov. 9, 1866, Ibid., pp. 391-395."
However, when being taken from the prison, Surratt made his escape, leaping from a height of twenty feet to a very narrow ledge beyond which was a precipice. Surratt boarded the steamer, "Tripoli" at Naples. When the steamer docked in Alexandria, Surratt was apprehended by the consul there. King obtained easily the discharge of Ste. Marie from the Papal Zouaves. "I beg to inform you", Ste. Marie wrote King, "that I leave tomorrow for New York on board one of the French Steamers . . . I have been true and honest in this matter, and will remain so, even at the cost of my life. You will have no cause to regret what you have done for me, and I will stand true blue to the last". 26

The State Department was duly grateful for the cooperation of the Papal Government. "You cannot express too strongly to Cardinal Antonelli", wrote Seward, "the satisfaction of the President with the friendly and prompt proceedings of the Papal Government". 27

26. H. B. Ste. Marie to King, Feb. 1, 1867, Ibid., p. 413. Surratt was indicted by the grand jury of the County of Washington in the District of Columbia, and tried before a civil court. He was acquitted. Surratt admitted complicity in the conspiracy against Lincoln but declared he had no knowledge of Booth's plan to kill Lincoln, only of a plan to kidnap him. William P. Barton, The Life of Abraham Lincoln, II, pp. 354-355.

27. No. 47, Seward to King, Nov. 30, 1866, Stock, U. S. Ministers, p. 393.
The last years of the Roman mission saw the decline of the Pope's temporal power and the imminent danger of its extinction. The Pope now controlled only the city of Rome and its immediate environs and it was French bayonets which assured him even this. The departure of the French soldiers from the Papal States in 1866 caused the Papal authorities considerable anxiety. In his address to the departing French officers the Pope declared: "They tell me, and they write home, that I ought to have confidence; but has not an august personage again said of late that 'Italy was made but not completed'? The revolution, does it not talk of planting its flag upon the capitol? ... The revolution thunders at my gates, but like St. Augustine at Hippo, I pray God that I may die sooner than assist in my own ruin."28 In an audience with King the Pontiff spoke despondently about the withdrawal of the French, declaring that "the poor Pope would be left all alone in his little boat29 in the midst of the tempestuous ocean". 30 "Every day of quiet is

28. No. 71, Idem to idem, Dec. 10, 1866, Ibid., pp. 403-404. When St. Augustine lay dying the barbarians were besieging Hippo. The saint prayed that he might die sooner than see the fall of the city. In answer to his prayers death came. "So prays Pio Nono now!" exclaimed King. Ibid.

29. A reference to the "Immaculate Conception", the only vessel in the Pontifical navy.

a day gained", affirmed the Pontiff. "They tell me the Republicans are coming to Rome, oanti qui oante; that Garibaldi, Mazzini, are coming and mean to make Rome the capital of Italy. Well, we will wait and see. This (he pointed to the crucifix on his table) is all my artillery."

King received intimations from several officials of the pontifical Government that the presence of an American warship at Civita Vecchia would be appreciated and that "if the Pope felt compelled to abandon Rome he might seek a refuge in the United States". Writing to Seward he declared:

"General Kansler, the Minister of War, and Monsignor Nardi, Domestic Chaplain to the Pope—both, it must be presumed, in his Holiness' confidence—each expressed very explicitly the opinion, that the only country in which the Pope could seek and find a suitable and secure Asylum was the great Republic of America. General Kansler added the expression of his earnest hope that the Pope would take this course and seemed anxious to know how I thought it would be received in the United States. I contented myself with replying, in general terms, that our country was the home of civil and religious liberty, as well as the refuge of all who fled from political, and other troubles in the old world; and that his Holiness, should he see fit to go to the United States, would no doubt meet with a kind welcome and be left to pursue, unquestioned and unmolested, his great work as Head of the Catholic Church. I cannot but think, from


32. The Commanding Officer of the European Squadron was ordered to station a vessel at Civita Vecchia. No. 50, Seward to King, Dec. 8, 1866, Ibid., p. 402."
these and similar indications that this project of
goins to America is seriously entertained by a posi-
tion, at least, of the Pope's most trusted friends
and counsellors and I know that his Holiness himself
has spoken of it more than once and in terms that
seemed to imply approval. 33

In Seward's opinion there was not sufficient evidence to
warrant the belief that the Pope would seek refuge in the
United States. 34 In November, 1866, Cardinal Antonelli
assured King that the Pope did not intend to leave Rome. 35

With the collapse of the temporal power evidently
near, King wrote for instructions concerning his course of
action in the event that the Pope was forced to leave Rome. 36
Seward replied that he was free either to remain in Rome
or to go to some near-by state. Seward further instructed
him to discontinue his diplomatic functions "within the
territory in which a new government shall have been established." 37

The American mission did not outlive the temporal
power. Congress voted in 1867 to discontinue the appropria-
tions for the mission, thus bringing it to a close.

33. No. 63, King to Seward, Nov. 20, 1866, Ibid.,
pp. 398-399.

34. No. 51, Seward to King, Dec. 10, 1866, Ibid.,
p. 404.

35. No. 66, King to Seward, Nov. 10, 1866, Ibid.,
pp. 398-399.

36. No. 60, King to Seward, July 24, 1866, Ibid.,
pp. 373-375.

37. No. 43, Seward to King, Aug. 16, 1866, Ibid.,
p. 379.
THE CLOSING OF THE MISSION AT ROME

In January of 1867 rumors began to reach the United States that the Papal Government had taken action to move the American Protestant church outside the walls of the city. Before Mr. King could provide full information on the subject, Congress acted to close the mission. On January 24 Representative Dodge, Republican from New York, put forward a resolution, unanimously consented to, requesting the President to communicate to the House any information relative to the removal of the American Protestant church at Rome. 1 A few days later the speaker laid before the House a message from the President, containing a report of Secretary of State Seward to the effect that he had received no information on the subject. 2

When the bill for appropriations for consular and diplomatic expenses came before the House, Williams, Republican from Pennsylvania, rose and moved that "Rome" should be struck out of the bill, since there was no reason to maintain diplomatic relations with a "foreign hierarchy".

2. Ibid., II, p. 844.
Theodosius Stevens, Republican from Pennsylvania, wanted to go a step farther and state in the bill that it was "beneath the dignity and contrary to justice" for the United States to be represented at a court which did not allow freedom of worship to American citizens. Chenler, Democrat from New York, objected that the same rule must apply to the Court of Constantinople because of the tyrannical attitude of the Oecumen toward Christians. Furthermore, he remarked, the rule against Protestant worship was in existence before the American mission was established and therefore was recognized by the United States. In response to this objection Stevens replied that the exercise of Christianity was protected at Constantinople and that it had been only lately that the American church had been excluded from Rome. With a touch of sarcasm Chenler then objected to the wording of Stevens' amendment, since it did not include the treatment of Christians by the Turkish government. He condemned the whole proposition of Stevens as "a direct expression of Protestant resentment against the Papal Government of Rome". "The secret motive of every government in maintaining the peculiar opinions of its own..."
people should be respected here, he maintained. Mohammedans exclude unbelievers from Mecca, and the reasons why Protestants are excluded from Rome should not be subject to debate. "They have as much right," concluded Chalmers, "to exclude the Protestant church from the walls of Rome as the gentlemans on the floor and elsewhere who, under the organisation of Know-Nothingism, would have branded every man who differed with it on the question of religion."

At this point Representative Banks, Union Republican from Massachusetts, injected a note of caution into the debate, suggesting that nothing should be done until official information had been secured. Throughout the ensuing debate several representatives warned that no action should be taken without official confirmation of the removal of the American Protestant church, but their warning seemed to have little effect.

6. Both Hill, Republican from Indiana, and Finck, Democrat from Ohio, expressed the view that the mission should not be closed on religious grounds. "It is not in accordance with the principles, theory, or practice of this Government," said Hill, "to interfere in this indirect way any more than to interfere more directly with the religious practice of another Government." Ibid., p. 884.

6. "For the gentleman from Pennsylvania," declared Finck, "to press this question in the absence of all official information seems to be a more thrust at the Catholic population of this country and at the authorities at Rome." Ibid., p. 851. "If we propose," stated Banks, "to sever our diplomatic relations with Rome altogether, we ought to have some facts to justify our action." Ibid., p. 833.
Dodge read two letters from overseas in which the closing of the American church was declared to be but a matter of time. In one letter the imminent collapse of the temporal power was adduced as a reason for the discontinuance of diplomatic relations with Rome. "Our embassy to the Pope", the letter read, "is a ridiculous absurdity. . . . There might have been some excuse for it a few years ago, when the Papal States were quite a respectable Power. But since the late revolutions those States have shrunk away almost to nothing, and the little remainder is just ready to be swallowed by the kingdom of Italy."

It was further objected by Stevens that the Pope did not reciprocate by sending a representative to the United States. This objection was set aside by Banks, who asserted that this was no real reason to complain, since the American people would object to the customary

6. Ibid., p. 333. King declared that it had been intimated that the closing of the mission was designed as an indirect recognition of the claim of Victor Emmanuel to all Italy and as withdrawal of recognition of the temporal power. The supposed closing of the American church was only a pretext. King hoped that the recognition of the now Italy would be done in such a way as to "reflect no discredit upon our country and leave no just cause of complaint to the governments of Europe." No. 66, King to Seward, March 1, 1867, Stock, U.S. Ministers, pp. 420-422.
precedence granted Papal diplomats over the representatives of other countries.

The old argument of economy found place again. Morrill, Republican from Vermont, referred to the mission as "a useless expenditure, merely to provide a place for some one who wants the position". From Morrill's viewpoint a consul at Rome was sufficient since the Pope's territory was now confined to the city of Rome itself.

Morrill's assertion that the Pope was the only foreign power to recognize the Confederacy brought a vehement denial from Banks, who said that the Pope only wrote a letter in reply to Jefferson Davis in which he addressed Davis by the same title that Davis had used in his letter and that the Pope did not express sympathy for the Southern cause but only a desire for peace.

In opposition to the accusation that the mission to the Papal Government had no practical value, the service of the Roman Government in apprehending Surratt was mentioned, but, when a request was made for the reading of the diplomatic correspondence concerning this case, the debate was summarily brought to a close by the chairman.

On January 31, 1867, after two days debate, the


8. Ibid., p. 683.
final vote on the continuation of the mission was taken with the result that eighty-two members voted against it and eighteen for it. 9

The bill was introduced into the Senate on February 1, referred to the Committee on Finance, and finally approved without debate.

On March 2, President Johnson transmitted King's despatch of February 19, in which he explained fully the action of the Papal authorities in regard to the American church. It is doubtful whether the information derived from this despatch would have affected the final decision of Congress to eliminate the Roman mission.

The situation that had precipitated the action of Congress in refusing to appropriate funds for the continuation of the Roman mission was the alleged threat of the Papal authorities to move the American Protestant church outside the walls of Rome in accordance with Roman law forbidding the Protestant worship within the city walls. 10 According to diplomatic custom a foreign minister is entitled to the

9. Ibid., p. 885.

10. While Cass was representative at the Papal Court, a rumor circulated that the Protestant church had been closed. "I have every reason to believe", he wrote to Webster, "that it will remain unmolested so long as no charge is established against it as a Missionary institution". No. 40, Cass to Webster, March 18, 1851, Ibid., p. 84.
privilege of religious worship according to his choice in a private chapel attached to the legation, where his fellow countryman may join him in worship. Provision for American Protestant worship had been made when Cass was representative in Rome. In his despatch to Clayton on March 7, 1859, he remarks that Protestant worship was permitted by the Papal Government for the first time to American citizens in Rome. After the first service, the Reverend Mr. Hastings, chaplain to the legation, received orders from the police to discontinue his services on penalty of expulsion from the Papal dominions, but Cass obtained from the Cardinal Secretary of State permission to continue services apart from the legation, declaring that such a concession would be very gratifying to the United States, "which had taken the initiative in the establishment of political relations between the two countries.

For many years after the establishment of the legation the American chapel was housed in the palace of Duke Salviati, where the legation headquarters were also. Because the large crowds which attended the chapel services attracted much attention, the Duke declined to renew the lease for the apartments unless the chapel was dispensed with. The Duke's wife also seemed to be opposed to housing Protestants

under her roof for, when King changed his place of residence, she had the room, which had been used for a chapel, thoroughly cleaned and fumigated.\textsuperscript{12} Dr. Lyman, the pastor, decided to rent another place of worship in a more centrally located place where, without interference from the authorities, he conducted worship according to the forms of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

In the meantime, the Scotch Presbyterians, who also assembled within the walls, attracted the attention of the authorities by forming another congregation. They were forthwith ordered outside the walls and transferred to a building occupied by the English Protestants.\textsuperscript{13} Apprehensive that the same fate lay in store for the American chapel, King ordered the arms of the legation to be placed over the chapel door.\textsuperscript{14} No action was taken by the Papal authorities.

This was the situation at the time Congress acted to cut off the appropriation for the maintenance of the mission. In a despatch dated May 7, 1867, King informed

---

\textsuperscript{12} H. de Cesare, p. 111.

\textsuperscript{13} Mr. Godd Russell, diplomatic agent of the British Government, received instructions to thank the Papal Government for "not having entirely deprived the Scotch Presbyterians of the right to meet for purposes of religious worship". No. 67, King to Seward, Feb. 18, 1867, Stock, \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 414-416.

\textsuperscript{14} No. 83, King to Seward, Feb. 18, 1867, Stock, \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 414-416.

\textsuperscript{15} Stock, \textit{U. S. Ministers}, pp. 429-430.
the State Department that Cardinal Antonelli had notified J. Q. Hopper, the acting secretary of the legation, that at the beginning of the next season the American chapel would have to be housed under the roof of the minister or in the building assigned for Protestant worship outside the walls. 16 King in a despatch to Seward declared:

It results therefrom, that it is not His Holiness the Pope, but the American Congress who, by closing the mission here, have driven American Protestant worship outside the gates of Rome. So long as the United States had representative at the Papal Court and a Chapel connected with the United States Legation, no interference whatever was thought of, or attempted, with American Protestant worship in this Catholic city. It owes its suppression in Rome to the suppression of the American Legation, to Congress and not to the Pope. It is this fact which renders it all the more difficult for me to announce to His Holiness that the United States withdraws its Representative at the Papal Court and breaks off all Diplomatic intercourse with the Papal Government, on the alleged, but erroneous ground, that the Pope refuses to permit Protestant worship within the walls of Rome. 17

When the "unlocked for intelligence that the American mission at Rome was about to be closed by Congress" reached Rome, King set down in a despatch to Seward 18 the reasons why, in his estimation, the time was not opportune to terminate the mission. Referring to the number of American tourists who visited Rome, King declared:

16. This building had been occupied since 1825 by the English Protestants. Adjoining the Porta del Popolo, it was large, convenient, and within five or ten minutes walking distance from the principal hotels and lodging places occupied by Americans.

17. No. 92, King to Seward, May 7, 1867, Stock, Ibid., pp. 429-430.

18. No. 86, King to Seward, March 1, 1867, Stock, Ibid., pp. 420-422.
"The presence of an American minister is important to them since there are numerous occasions and various ways in which he can be of very great service". The friendliness of the Papal authorities, as evidenced by their prompt arrest of Surratt, was also brought forward as a reason for continuing the mission. "The sudden withdrawal of our representative now," asserted King, "when, as many believe, the hours of the Papal government are numbered, seems scarcely a generous return for this friendly conduct on their part toward the American government and people". Furthermore, the threatening situation in Europe made it imperative to retain a minister in Rome, according to King.

King inquired:

Is this the time to withdraw from Rome the American minister? Is it magnanimous in us to abandon the sovereign Pontiff in this hour of his waning fortunes? Shall we be the first among civilized and Christian nations to strike this blow at the Holy See? Are we to leave hundreds of our fellow-citizens to the possible chance of encountering the revolution face to face, and without a representative to vindicate their rights and protect their interests, and it may be their property and persons?19

On March 11, 1867, Seward informed King of the act of Congress in refusing appropriation for the maintenance of the mission, and the following month he forwarded instructions to King as to his course of action. "This law", stated Seward, "leaves your mission still existing,

---

19. Ibid.
but without compensation after that period". Seward gave
King three alternatives: (1) remain in Rome in charge of
the mission without pay, (2) present his resignation, or
(3) leave Rome without resigning on leave of absence. If he
determined to leave Rome, King was instructed to leave the
archives of the legation in charge of the American consul,
Gushman, who was notified to this effect in a despatch dated
April 20, 1867. 20 King determined to remain some longer in
Rome, "until recalled by the authority to which I owe my
appointment". 21 Seward approved King's action. 22

American artists resident in Rome and transient
visitors from the United States, as well as his colleagues
in the diplomatic corps and the functionaries of the Papal
Court, expressed their regret to King over the closing of
the mission. "The Pope," declared King, "felt hurt, thinking
it "an unkind and ungenerous return for the good will he
has always manifested toward the American government and
people". Evidently King found it rather difficult to take
formal leave of the Pope and Cardinal Antonelli. "I was
somewhat at a loss how to explain to his Eminence the

20. No. 50, Seward to King, April 20, 1867, Stock,
Ibid., p. 426.

21. No. 95, King to Seward, May 14, 1867, Stock,
Ibid., p. 430.

22. No. 59, Seward to King, June 1, 1867, Stock,
Ibid., p. 432.
sudden and unlocked for withdrawal of the American minister from the Papal court. In the end, he departed without taking formal leave. In a letter, written by Hooker to King after his return to the United States, Hooker stated that Cardinal Antonelli in an interview with him declared:

that, until you presented your letters of recall, or rescinded the one you wrote him (on leaving Rome last summer) he should consider you as still Minister and me as Secretary; and the Court Almanac, just published, has our names in it. Thus, up to the present time, the United States Legation exists in Rome and is carried on, as it always has been: Monsignor Facco writing to you, on Saturday last, for the names of American ladies, wishing tickets for the ceremonies of Holy Week, and I, to-day, sending them in.

It was King's desire on his return to the United States to publish the truth in regard to Protestant worship in Rome. "I should wish, too," he wrote Seward, "to make known the truth in regard to Protestant worship in Rome and with what invariable kindness and courtesy Americans, whether resident or transient, are treated by the Papal Authorities. It might temper the bigotry of some of our ultra-Presbyterian friends." After his return to New York he wrote to Seward again concerning the closing of

23. No. 92, King to Seward, May 7, 1867, Stock, Ibid., pp. 429-430.
25. King to Seward (Unofficial), May 7, 1867, Ibid., p. 427.
the American chapel:  

It is certainly somewhat annoying to me, personally, to find this story about the Pope's offering indignity to American citizens; compelling the closing of the American Chapel, etc; while I was the American representative there so widely spread and generally credited. . . . I did my best, at the time, and have endeavoured, repeatedly, since, to correct the misapprehensions which prevailed on this subject, but, apparently, without the slightest effect. The Pope's conduct toward American citizens, during the three and a half years that I filled the post of Minister Resident, was always kind and courteous; and towards myself, personally, as well as the Government I had the honor to represent, all that could be asked.26  

J. C. Hooker, acting secretary of the legation under both King and his predecessor, Blatchford, who had appointed him, was very desirous of perpetuating his connection with the legation, evidently because of the social prestige the association provided. When Hooker learned of King's decision to retire from the position, he requested King to write to Seward, urging Seward to appoint him chargé d'affaires. Indeed, as King pointed out in a despatch to Seward, 27 Hooker was well-fitted for the position since he was well acquainted with the Italian language and life, had many acquaintances with officials

of the Papal Government, leading Roman families, as well as members of the diplomatic corps, and had good business connections. So desirous was Hooker of obtaining this position that he was willing to perform the duties without compensation. "A Consulate I do not care for", he wrote to Seward's son, "even if it should become vacant. I suppose your Father could write to Genl. King to give up the archives etc. to me and could write me to keep up a diplomatic character—No salary or remuneration will be asked for and the Roman Govt. will be pleased to have no here and your Father will have as He ever has had a warm friend in Rome." Hooker's desires were ignored by the Secretary of State, who left Cushman, the American consul in Rome, in charge of the affairs of the legation.

It now remains to consider why Congress closed the mission to Rome. A perusal of the debates recorded in the "Congressional Globe" leaves one with the impression that the rumored closing of the American chapel in Rome was not

---

28. J. C. Hooker to F. W. Seward, Mar. 30, 1867, *Ibid.*, p. 425. Hooker wrote to King, after his return to the United States, a letter which, he told King, he would "not mind, if you sent it to Mr. Seward and Mr. Sumner for perusal". "If Mr. Seward and Mr. Sumner would agree," he continued, "I might be made diplomatic agent here and attend to matters as I have done... Otherwise, as I have said to you before, I must retire if my position is to be questioned." Hooker to King, Mar. 25, 1868, *Ibid.*, pp. 436-437.

the real reason but only a pretense. Despite the warning of several representatives that action without official confirmation of the removal of the chapel should not be taken, the bill was rushed through. From the evidence available it appears that the conflict between the executive and legislative, which was to culminate in the impeachment of Johnson, was the most important factor in terminating the mission.

The Radical Republicans who controlled the Congress after the Civil War were strongly opposed by President Johnson and Secretary of State Seward. The mission to Portugal had been suppressed by Congress because the minister, James E. Harvey, in a letter to the Secretary of State, later made public, had lauded the administration and criticized Congress. Thaddeus Stevens, the Radical Republican leader in the House, who later was active in the impeachment proceeding against Johnson, in answer to question as to why the appropriation for the mission to Portugal was withheld, answered:

The reason the appropriation was omitted last year was that there had appeared in the New York papers a very long letter from Mr. Harvey to the Secretary of State, in which, among other things, after a fulsome eulogy of the President, to which I did not object because I thought it very becoming, he indulged in a most foul and vulgar abuse of Congress. 30

Although his salary was withheld, Harvey remained at his post, thus further irritating Congress. Making certain that his hearers were aware of the fact that Congress was the "vox populi", Senator Fogg of New Hampshire fumed:

"The State Department has been guilty of contumacy; the State Department have defied Congress, and in defying Congress have defied the voice of the nation. No matter whether Mr. Harvey has received his pay or not, no matter whether Mr. Harvey shall hereafter receive his pay or not, it was the bounden duty of all Departments of this Government to respect the voice of Congress as the voice of the nation; and if the Secretary of State has treated Mr. Harvey as the minister-resident he has done it knowingly, he has done it knowing that he was defying the voice of Congress and the voice of the nation."

In October, 1866, George McCrackin, an American travelling abroad, wrote President Johnson that he had found in the course of his journeys that the majority of the American diplomats and consuls were bitterly opposed to the administration. In particular he accused John L. Motley, the minister in Vienna, of openly criticizing the President before the representative of a foreign government. Seward began an investigation which resulted in

---

32. Ibid., p. 1603.
Motley's resignation. Rufus King, the minister to Rome, was one of the few whose loyalty to the administration was not questioned. Furthermore, he was a close friend of Seward's. What better way for the opponents of the administration to strike at Seward than through his friend, Rufus King? Thus the antagonism between Congress and the executive expressed itself in the failure to appropriate funds for the continuation of the Roman Mission, forcing one of the loyal supporters of the administration from his position.

Personal antagonism played a part in the termination of the Roman Mission, although it is difficult to determine how much influence it exerted. A controversy arose between the American consul in Rome, W. J. Stillman, and J. G. Hooker, the secretary of the legation, over the need for American citizens to obtain the consul's visa on their passports before leaving the Papal dominions. Stillman evidently enjoyed exercising the authority of his office and rejoiced in the difficulties he caused Confederate travellers during the Civil War. In his autobiography he states:

I was continually at war with the Confederate Americans, galled to extreme bitterness by the right I had of compelling them to take the oath of allegiance before renewing their passports. . . . This social warfare, the consequence of my official position, had the effect of giving me occupation and excitement in Rome, so that the position though unremunerative, was
rather pleasant than otherwise.  

Noticing that some Americans were permitted to leave the Papal territory without the consul's visa, Hooker determined to inquire of the Papal Secretary of State the reason for this. The Papal authorities had not insisted upon Southerners securing the consular visa, knowing it was repugnant to their consciences, and in answer to Hooker's query if it was possible for American citizens to leave Papal territory without the visa of the American consul, the Cardinal replied, "We do not require it. . . . If an American going to France for example, can enter France without the Consul's visa, all very well, we have nothing to do with that." Thus Hooker obtained for Union Americans the same privilege enjoyed by Southerners. "I do not expect", declared Hooker, "a vote of thanks from Mr. Stillman for relieving Americans from the fee he has hitherto exacted".  

Stillman, resentful of Hooker's

---


35. Cardinal Antonelli told Mann, the Confederate envoy, that "he intended to take such 'Rebels' under his special protection, because it would be making exactions upon elevated humanity which it was incapable of conscientiously complying with, to expect them to take an oath of allegiance to a country which they bitterly detested". No. 68, Mann to Benjamin, Nov. 21, 1863, B. R., III, pp. 963-964.

interference, promptly accused Hooker to the State Department of being disloyal to the Union by aiding Southerners to depart from Rome without the consul's approval. Seward wrote to King, requesting him to conduct a "careful inquiry upon the subject, and report the result to the Department". 37 Both Blatchford and King wrote the Department of State on behalf of Hooker with the result that he was completely exonerated. In a letter to Seward, Hooker denied Stillman's charges, urging "that a man who is treating me as he does is not worthy of holding a place under the U. S. Government". 38 Stillman was later removed from his position as consul at Rome, and Cushman took his place.

Hiding his time to secure revenge, Stillman was never able to forgive Hooker or King. His opportunity came with the arrival in Rome of George G. Fogg, then American minister to Switzerland, later a member of the thirty-ninth Congress which brought the Roman Mission to a close. Stillman wrote:

As fortune would have it there was in Rome that winter (1864) Mr. George G. Fogg, the minister of the United States of America at Bern, a personal friend of Lincoln, and chairman of the Young Men's National Committee, which arranged the convention that nominated him. On Lincoln's election Fogg was offered his choice of the diplomatic appointments, and selected Bern, the

37. No. 8, Seward to King, April 18, 1864, Ibid., pp. 231-232.
38. Hooker to Seward, June 9, 1864, Ibid., p. 304.
most modest position he could take. He came to pass the Christmas holidays at Rome, and of course I laid my case before him. He in turn put it before his late colleagues in the House, and the committee of foreign affairs made a strong representation at the Department of State; and when Seward refused to recall King, or take any measures to correct the injustice done me, they struck out from the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill the appropriation for the legation at Rome, which meant the abolition of the legation.69

Stillman thus claims all the credit for the termination of the mission, but there is no evidence that Fogg ever acted on Stillman's representations. Furthermore, Stillman would have a personal reason for claiming the credit for the ending of the Roman mission, since it would satisfy his wounded pride to show that he had obtained satisfaction for the supposed injury inflicted upon him.

It is probable that religious prejudice affected the decisions of some of the Congressmen. Stevens and Williams show evidence of this in their comments on the floor of the House of Representatives. Also political bias may have affected some of the votes. It was a Democratic administration which instituted the Roman mission; it was a Republican Congress which brought it to a termination.

Until 1848 relations between the United States and the Papal States had been handled satisfactorily through the American consul in Rome. There was no apparent need for more formal diplomatic relations. Indeed it may be questioned whether the maintenance of a minister to the Papal States was worth the candle to the American government. Except for the Civil War years, when a minister extraordinary might have handled relations, American interests might as easily have been cared for by the consul. As the collapse of the temporal power grew imminent, there was still less excuse for the continuation of the mission.

A survey of the debates in the House and Senate on the opening of the mission shows that religious prejudice was the chief factor in the opposition. Levin exemplified the anti-Catholic attitude. Senator Badger, although not appealing to religious bigotry as did Levin,

1. The American consul was accorded by the Papal authorities many of the privileges of a diplomatic agent, such as admisses to ecclesiastical functions on the same level as diplomatic functionaries and the observance of courtesies in private and public presentations to the Pontiff, usually extended only to diplomats. Brown to Buchanan, April 24, 1847, Stock, Consular Relations, p. 95.

2. Seward had written to Bletchford: "This govern-
opposed the mission on the ground of Protestant reaction throughout the United States. The political motive was not absent. The burning issue of the day, slavery, was drawn into the argument by Levin's effort to show that the Pope was opposed to slavery and therefore to American institutions. This was a bid for the support of the Southern Whigs.

In the closing of the mission the political factor was dominant. Opposition to the administration took the form of thwarting the President's wishes. Ring had been one of the few in the foreign service not accused of disloyalty to the administration; therefore, he must be deprived of his position. As in the opening of the mission public opinion was sympathetic to its initiation, so in the closing of the mission public opinion, favorable to the cause of a united Italy, opposed the temporal power as the last barrier to complete unity. It is interesting to note that the liberal views of Pope Pius IX had been considered by Congress as one of the chief reasons for approving the establish-

ment has not now, it seldom has had, any special transaction, either commercial or political, to engage the attention of a Minister at Rome.
ment of the mission; yet the reactionary tendencies of the same Pontiff after his return from Gaeta, culminating as they did in the publication of the famous Syllabus of Errors in 1864, were not mentioned in Congress as a reason for bringing the mission to an end.

A comparison of the attitude of the United States toward the Roman Republic of 1849 and the attitude of the Holy See toward the Confederacy suggests some interesting parallels. The Americans were sympathetic to the republican cause in Rome, and Cass demonstrated this sympathy by extending aid to the rebel leaders when the republic fell. During the Civil War the Confederate envoys were received by the Papal authorities with cordiality and allowed to present their case. Although opposed to slavery, both the Pope and Antonelli favored a policy of gradual emancipation. Southerners in Rome were exempt from the requirement of obtaining the consul's visa. The Holy See opposed the recruiting system of the North. However, both governments refused to recognize the rebel groups.

3. Although some attempted to use the letter of Pio Nono to Davis as proof of Papal recognition, those in authority disavowed any such recognition. Even Benjamin, Confederate secretary of state, did not look on it as a recognition of the Confederacy. v. supra, pp. 96-97. In the debates on the closing of the mission Thaddeus Stevens affirmed that the Pope was the only
A perusal of the diplomatic relations between the Papal States and the United States reveals one outstanding fact: the Papal Government wished to maintain friendly relations with the United States and made a more than ordinary effort to do so. The concession of Protestant worship during Cass's ministry, the prompt apology and restitution in the Perugia and Glentworth cases, and the action of the Papal Government in arresting Surratt are examples of this friendly attitude.

This desire was reciprocated by the United States. The concern over the reception of Archbishop Bedini and the dispatching of a vessel to Civitavecchia in 1866 at the desire of the Papal authorities are evidence of American good-will.

Interesting, too, are the omissions in the types of problems handled by the United States minister in Rome. No use was made, apparently, of the mission to carry out, break, or strengthen the Pope's position as leader of American Catholics. No use was made of the mission as a means of transporting church money from

power to recognize the Confederacy. Stevens was apparently making here a clever appeal to the prejudice of the anti-Southerners, so numerous in the House at that time.
American dioceses to Rome. Another interesting omission is that no negotiations were carried on between Washington and Rome over the Pope's recognition of Maximilian as emperor of Mexico, in spite of America's open and firm opposition to that regime.
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