

AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

WITH THE PAPAL STATES

BY

JOHN McCULLEN

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the College
Department of St. Meinrad Seminary in Par-
tial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts.

January, 1942

St. Meinrad, Indiana



OUTLINE

I. Our present relations with the Holy See.

- A. Recent discussion of our relations with the Holy See.
- B. The mission of Mr. Kennedy.
- C. The mission of Mr. Taylor.

II. Informal diplomatic relationship, 1784-1848.

- A. Early recognition of the United States by the Papal Government.
- B. Establishment of a Consulate at Rome.
 - 1. Quasi-diplomatic status of our Consulate.
 - 2. Administration of John and Vincent Sartori.
 - 3. Administration of Felix Cicognani.
 - a. Our administration of Mexican ecclesiastical affairs.
 - b. The visit of Bishop Conwell.
 - 4. Administration of George Greene.
 - a. The settlement of the case of Bishop Reze.
 - b. Complaints about Mr. Greene.
 - c. Investigation of Mr. Greene and his resignation.
 - 5. Administration of Nicholas Browne.
 - a. His negligence of duty.
 - b. His "recognition" of the Roman Republic.
 - c. The illegal and irregular nature of this recognition.

III. Our formal diplomatic relations with the Holy See, 1848-1868.

A. Appointment of an American charge d'affaires in Rome.

1. Reasons given for establishment of Legation in Rome.
 - a. Commercial hopes.
 - b. Political reasons.
 - c. Popularity of Pius IX in the United States.
 - d. Example of other powers.
2. Motives for opposition to the establishment of Legation.
 - a. Commercial unimportance.
 - b. Political opposition to Polk administration.
 - c. Religious bigotry.
3. Administration of Jacob Martin.
 - a. Public approval of his appointment.
 - b. His instructions from the State Department.
 - c. His reply to the State Department.
4. Administration of Lewis Cass, Jr.
 - a. Criticism of his appointment.
 - b. His instructions from the State Department.
 - c. His role in the Roman Revolution.
 - d. The Hastings Affair.
 - e. The Bedini Incident.

B. The American Minister-General in Rome.

1. Request of Cass for elevation.
2. Administration of John Stockman.

- a. Hill-Hall Affair settlement.
 - b. Perkins Incident settlement.
 - c. Apology for assault upon Glentworth.
 - d. Consideration of Sartori property claim.
- 3. Decline of the Papal States.
- 4. Opposition in Congress to continuence of Legation in Rome.
- 5. Appointment of Rufus King.
- 6. Administrations of Alexander Randal and Richard Blatchford.
- 7. Confederate attempts to obtain Papal recognition.
 - a. Mission of Dudley Mann.
 - b. Mission of Bishop Lynch.
- 8. Administration of Rufus King.
 - a. Courtesy of the Papal Government in the Surratt Affair.
 - b. Congressional repudiation of the Legation at Rome.
 - c. King's defense of our diplomatic relations with the Holy See.
- 9. Informal cessation of diplomatic relations in Rome.

IV. Present-day importance of our relations with the Holy See.

AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS
WITH THE PAPAL STATES

The question of diplomatic relations between the Papal Government and the American Government has recently been of wide interest. It seems entirely probable that, due to world conditions, this question may arise in a more challenging form in the near future. It is axiomatic that a diplomatic problem cannot be decided without reference to the history of the diplomatic relations in question. Particularly is this true where a special problem, such as the inter-relation of the secular state with a power primarily spiritual, is under consideration. Therefore an outline of the diplomatic history of these two states and an examination of the principles guiding these relations should prove of interest and value.

At the coronation of the present Holy Father there was present an officially accredited American diplomatic representative. He was Mr. Joseph Kennedy, at that time American Ambassador at the Court of St. James, and he was present as a personal representative of President Roosevelt. There was considerable discussion of this action in the United States. The Protestant press attempted to interpret this as a recognition of the Pope as a Spiritual Ruler, which they held contrary to the American tradition of separation of Church and State and of freedom of religion. Secular newspapers were inclined to view this as a courtesy extended to another sovereign state.

In December of 1939, the first year of the pontificate of Pius XII, the President appointed Myron Taylor as a personal representative at the Papal Court, with the specific mission of

confering with the Holy See to bring about world peace. This appointment was largely viewed as a movement for peace, and was commended. A few objected on "religious" grounds. The opponents of this appointment seemed unaware that there existed a tradition of many years for diplomatic relations with the Papacy. This mission of Mr. Taylor became the basis for much speculation about the possibility of resumption of full diplomatic relations between the United States and the Papacy, a contingency which appears by no means impossible. At present we are almost alone among the great powers in not maintaining formal diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

Very early in our history we entered into commercial and informal political relations with the papal government. On December 15, 1784, the papal nuncio at Paris wrote to the American Commissioners who were engaged in negotiation with the French government, that the papal government agreed to allow our ships to make use of the two papal ports, Civita Vecchia on the Mediterranean, and Ancona on the Adriatic. This was an action of diplomatic as well as commercial importance. It marks the first recognition of our new republic by a neutral world-power. It is true that the recognition was informal, but it came to us on the initiative of a European government which, although not a great power of the first rank, had nevertheless considerable prestige and influence in the diplomatic councils of the world. (1)

After this generous recognition by the papal government, it was natural that there should follow some action on the part of the American government. It is not surprising that this action was delayed for some years by the war and by the chaotic

conditions prevalent in the United States. The action of the Holy See had been a commercial action with diplomatic implications. Our action followed the same pattern. On June 26, 1797, the government of the United States of America appointed its first consul in the person of John Baptist Sartori. Like many of our foreign consuls at that time, he was not a citizen of the United States, but a resident of Rome and a subject of the papal states. The reason for this arrangement was the difficulty of attracting Americans on the scant salary of a consul. This same smallness of salary is undoubtedly the reason for the low esteem in which these important governmental posts were held, and the frequent incompetence of the men holding these posts.

Mr. Sartori was the first of eleven American Consuls at Rome. At times there were also consuls at Civita Vecchia, Ancono, and other places in the papal states. The consuls of these places were always Italians. (2)

Our first consul, Mr. Sartori, left Rome for America in April, 1800. His brother, Vincent, had been vice-consul, and was left in charge. The Papal Government protested against the informality of this arrangement in 1806. The American government replied to this protest by offering the post to John S. Cogdell, of Charleston, South Carolina. He refused, and this temporary state of affairs perdured until the appointment of Felix Cicognani in 1832.

During the administration of Mr. Cicognani, the volume of business handled by our office in Rome was greatly

increased by our acting as diplomatic representative for Mexico in Rome. In deference to the wishes of Spain, the Papacy refused to recognize the new Mexican Empire. Such notable matters as the obtaining of the decree secularizing the priests of the religious orders in Mexico were handled through the intervention of Mr. Cicognani. The American affairs at this time were rather routine, with the possible exception of the correspondence relating to the Roman visits of Bishop Conwell of Philadelphia. This prelate had been appointed to his see in 1820, and had proven incapable of settling the famous "Hogan Schism" in the Church of Philadelphia. For this cause he was recalled to Rome in 1827. Fearing that he would not be allowed to return to his see, Bishop Conwell returned unexpectedly and unannounced. The disturbance in Philadelphia grew worse rather than better, and the bishop was again recalled to Rome in 1829, where he resigned his see. (3)

The number of Americans living in Italy had gradually increased, and there was naturally a demand for a consul of American birth. In January, 1837, George W. Greene of Rhode Island, the grandson of the famous Nathanael Greene of revolutionary times, arrived in Rome as consul. The rejoicing of the Americans was soon turned into sorrow, for Mr. Greene was not a wealthy man, and was compelled to charge full fees for all his actions as consul. At this time there was no salary attached to the consular office, but it had been customary to appoint well-to-do men who would be satisfied to charge only a portion of the fees connected with the services that a consul must perform for his fellow-countrymen. There were complaints of various types made by Americans living in Rome about the official conduct of

Mr. Greene. He was charged both with neglecting his duties and with incompetence in performing them. In particular it was charged that he was unable to secure the usual permissions for American students to enable them to continue their studies in the Eternal City, and that consequently they were forced to apply to the British consul. He was negligent of mail entrusted to him, but interfered unnecessarily in the legal affairs of Americans, particularly in the wills of those dying in Rome. The most important complaint was the unusual fees which he was accustomed to charge. Daniel Webster was Secretary of State at the time. He seems to have conducted some sort of an investigation, for we find Mr. Greene being defended as to personal character by a committee of Americans, including such celebrities as President Felton of Harvard University and the poet Longfellow. Three years later Mr. Greene resigned, turning over his office to Nicholas Browne of New York in July, 1845.

A curious incident of Mr. Greene's administration, which he reported fully to the state department, was the visit to Rome of Bishop Reze. Bishop Reze was the first Bishop of Detroit, and had resigned his see in 1837. In August, 1841, he was in Rome, "engaged," as Greene reported to the State Department, "in some disagreeable negotiations." The outcome of these negotiations was a formal document, by which Bishop Reze renounced any claim to the ecclesiastical properties of the Diocese of Detroit, and was given a semi-annual pension of \$1000. The Bishop left Rome rather unexpectedly, soon after, with a Hanoverian passport, describing him, not as bishop, but as "missionary". Although the incident is yet unexplained, it seems likely that Bishop Reze was not entirely in possession of his faculties.

For this reason he had resigned his diocese, and the Holy See was anxious to provide for him and to prevent any unscrupulous person from taking advantage of him and of the Diocese of Detroit, for the laws governing ecclesiastical property in the United States at that time were vague. Future history seems to bear this conclusion out, for Bishop Reze wandered about in Europe for many years, often in a condition bordering upon actual want. (4)

Nicholas Browne was the last American Consul to exercise quasi-diplomatic functions in Rome, for formal diplomatic relations were opened in 1848. Mr. Clark, our Vice-Consul at Rome, complained to James Buchanan in 1847 that Mr. Browne was gravely negligent of his duties. Being a wealthy man, he spent most of his time traveling. Considering the imprudent nature of some of his actions, it seems just as well that he was not consistently in Rome. His period in office coincided with the revolution in Rome, which drove the Papal Government to Gaeta, in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and put in power in Rome the short-lived ²³Maximilian republic. Mr. Browne had returned to Rome upon the death of Jacob Martin, our first charge d'affaires at Rome, and had taken charge of the legation. He greeted the revolutionary government with "warmest congratulations", and assured them that the American Government "would take the first opportunity to recognize (the government) of Rome in the most satisfactory manner." In the same surprising statement, he relieved himself of the sentiment, "the Papacy is fallen, morally fallen forever", and added that "the love of liberty is so deeply rooted in every American heart that the

nation will at once hail with joy the Independence of the Roman Republic long before their diplomatic agents can have time, in due official form, to give expression to the generous sentiments of their constituency."

In his official uniform Mr. Brown attended the first session of the Constitutional Assembly of the revolutionary government. All of these actions were most extraordinary. Mr. Browne had no right to commit his government to a definite course of action, and especially an action at variance with the policy of the late charge, Mr. Martin. Browne was not even a temporary minister, but was merely in possession of the office, and should not have taken any action at all without first consulting Washington. He was obviously expressing his personal views and hoping by what he thought to be a clever stratagem, to force them upon the American Government. Further, his action was at variance with the procedure followed by all the instructed legations of all nations represented diplomatically at Rome. The entire diplomatic corps accompanied the Pope into exile at Gaeta. This action was unanimously taken, not only to express the sympathy of established governments with a government which had been attacked by a lawless revolutionary mob, but also because everyone was quite certain that the Mazzini republic could not last and would, indeed, collapse within a few months. Browne's militant sympathies with the republican government was, of course, embarrassing to the United States--particularly after French troops occupied Rome and overthrew Mazzini. There was an unfortunate incident resulting from the attitude of our consul; some of Browne's domestic servants had been encouraged by their master's stand to insult the French army of occupation,

even to the extent of throwing objects down on the soldiers from the roof of Mr. Browne's house. The soldiers entered the house, not knowing that it enjoyed diplomatic immunity, and allegedly threatened everyone, and seized the servants. The French military authorities apologized for this when it was called to their attention. When the Papal Government returned to Rome, the United States, aware that Mr. Browne was persona non grata, requested his resignation. William Carroll Sanders of Mobile replaced him on May 29, 1849.

The American consul at Rome was well able to care for the commercial interests of the United States at the Papal States. The diplomatic affairs which had passed through this office in the half-century of its existence were, as we have seen, not very considerable. It is interesting, therefore, to examine the motives of our government in seeking fuller and more formal diplomatic relations. It is true that Nicholas Browne had reported to Secretary of State Buchanan (June 1, 1847) that the Holy See had expressed the desire of formal relations with the great republic of the west. But our motives were well stated by President Polk in his annual message to Congress on December 7, 1847. "The interesting political events now in progress in these States (the Papal States), as well as a just regard for our commercial interests, have, in my opinion, rendered such a measure (setting up of a legation) highly expedient." The "interesting political events" were principally the struggle for unity in the Italian States, and the democratic reforms of Pius IX, which were followed in the United States with great interest and approval. Pius IX, then

in the second year of his pontificate, was something of a hero in the United States--a thing quite surprising, for his Church was not especially popular among a people accustomed to elect several representatives and senators from the ranks of the Know-Nothing Party each year. (5)

The actions of the pontiff in releasing political prisoners, granting freedom of the press, creating a national guard, granting a constitution, etc., were popular among Americans at home and abroad. The Americans in Rome attended the installation of the deputies of the new legislative assembly, bearing American flags and branches of laurel. American newspapers praised Pius IX in the extravagant fashion of that day. Horace Greeley, of "Go West, Young Man" fame, presided over a large and enthusiastic public meeting held at Broadway Tabernacle in New York City on November 29, 1847. Speeches were made and a message was sent to the Holy Father assuring him of the admiration of all true Americans for his liberal reforms and hoping in the success of these measures. The Pope was compared, in this message, to "Moses of old, leading the people of Israel by a cloud by day and by a pillar of fire by night." The President of the United States was petitioned to open full diplomatic relations with this progressive and enlightened ruler. (6)

To such petitions did President Polk yield in his recommendations to Congress. It was hoped, as the President indicated, that more profitable commercial relations would grow out of recognition. This hope proved in vain. But there were other solid reasons for maintaining a legation at Rome. Rome was the commercial and political center for all of the Italian

states. All the great powers had legations there, and it was an international political center. The papacy not only enjoyed political influence throughout the world, but also, and more important, wielded great moral authority throughout the Christian world.

The President's recommendation was approved, but not without some opposition in Congress. The debate continued for several days; most of the objections were quite legitimate, for it was certainly possible to question the need of a legation in the Papal States on the basis of the insignificance of our commercial and diplomatic relations with the Holy See. There was some of the traditional partisan opposition of the minority party in Congress, and President Polk was accused of proposing this measure for the purpose of gaining Catholic support. In the House of Representatives, however, there was some opposition on purely religious grounds. Representative Lewis Leven of Pennsylvania was a leading Know-Nothing, and had been involved in the Anti-Catholic Kensington riots, and in the burning of St. Augustine's and St. Michael's Churches in Philadelphia. His violent attack on the Church did not seem to harm President Polk's measure, for the Senate voted in favor of the establishment of a legation, 36-7, and the House pass the bill 137-15. (7)

President Polk's choice of a charge to the Papal States met with unanimous approval throughout the country, even in those sources previously opposed to diplomatic relations with Rome. Mr. Jacob L. Martin, our first charge, had much diplomatic experience, and had previously served as secretary of the American Legation at Paris. He was a capable man, and his dispatches

to the State Department show him as a man of prudence, judgement, and culture. His conduct during the revolutionary movement in Rome is in great contrast to the impetuous and unfortunate position taken by Nicholas Browne, the American Consul. Even before leaving Paris for his new post, Mr. Martin was visited by Italian revolutionists who wished him to manifest public sympathy for their cause. He arrived in Rome August 2, 1848. On August 19 he was formally received by the Holy Father, and engaged in a long and friendly discussion of the political conditions of the Papal States, and the difficulties consequent upon transforming this ancient state into a representative, limited monarchy. Unfortunately, Mr. Martin died suddenly within a month after arriving in Rome. His death was caused by the fevers then common in the Eternal City. Although not previously a Catholic, there is solid evidence to indicate that he became a Catholic upon his death-bed. Certainly, his understanding of the difficult position of the papal government is unusual, and indicates sympathy and breadth of view. In his official instructions to Mr. Martin, James Buchanan, the American Secretary of State, had written: "Whilst our established policy renders it impossible that we should interfere with the forms of government or the domestic institutions of other independent peoples, the American people can never be indifferent to the cause of constitutional freedom and liberal reform in any part of the world." This statement was to serve as a guide in dealing with the republican movement in Rome. Martin's answer is most illuminating. "Putting aside the religious view, the papacy is not only a great, but a 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.... The alliance of freedom and religion were wiser than their conflict.... Sincere men, not unfriendly to freedom, think that it would have been wiser to leave power for some time longer in the hands of the Pope who was effecting many important reforms and was gradually preparing the people for the practice of constitutional government." (8)

Lewis Cass, Jr., of Michigan, was Jacob Martin's successor. There was some political objection to his appointment, as he was a "lame duck" appointment of the defeated Democratic Party. Further strength was given to this objection by the fact that the defeated presidential candidate of the Democrats was Mr. Cass's father, General Lewis Cass, Sr.

It was quite natural that, the United States being a republic, we should tend to favor the republican government struggling for control in Rome. Jacob Martin's caution and understanding of the difficult political situation may have had some influence in moderating the republican sympathies of Secretary Buchanan. At any rate, in his first instruction to Mr. Cass, the Secretary repudiated the "recognition" of the revolutionary government which Nicholas Browne had promised and attempted to extend. Mr. Cass was ordered to go to Rome and to present credentials to neither government. Not to the Pope, for he was in Gaeta, "and 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." Not to the Roman Government, for "although it has been the constant

policy and practice of this government to recognize existing Governments, without inquiring into their legitimacy; yet with this exception, that they shall have first afforded evidence of their will and their power to maintain their independence. This cannot yet be asserted in regard to the existing Government at Rome. Its recent origin and the almost insuperable difficulties by which it is surrounded, render it extremely doubtful whether it will be able to maintain itself." (9)

Notwithstanding these publically-known instructions, the Mazzini government made every attempt to secure the favor of Mr. Cass. He was able, through his influence with this government, to prevent the possible destruction of the College of the Propaganda, at which there were American students, and various other ecclesiastical buildings, on the plea that their destruction would tend to create unfavorable sentiment in the United States toward the republican regime.

On July 3, 1849, the French army entered Rome at the request of Pius IX. The French commander, General Oudinot, and the French minister heading the French mission to Rome asked Mr. Cass to be the bearer of terms between their military, encamped at Civita Vecchia, and the revolutionary government in Rome. This Mr. Cass refused, as he had previously declined the request of the Prince of Canino, acting for the republican government, to negotiate with the French and the Papacy. As American representative, Cass could not act as a partisan, and it was assumed in both of these proposals that he would act as the friend of the Roman Republicans. When the French army entered Rome, the Mazzini government collapsed. The Pope returned as soon as order could be restored, and Mr. Cass was received by

the Pope on April 19, 1850. Pius IX asked the charge to convey his thanks to the American Government and people for their attitude during the troubles, and the financial support of American Catholics received during his exile.

An interesting example of American influence at the court of Pius IX was the Hastings Case in 1850. Public Protestant religious services were not allowed in Rome. A certain Reverend Mr. Hastings of New York held such illegal services, and was warned by the police that he would be deported if this incident were repeated. Mr. Cass appealed to the Cardinal Secretary of State, acknowledging that we had no right to interfere in this purely domestic law of the Papal States, but asking an exception for Reverend Hastings as a gratuitous favor to the United States. This favor was granted, and the Cardinal-Secretary gracefully alluded to "the protection to life and property which the American Legation had afforded during the recent anarchy."

In his frequent dispatches to the American Secretaries of State, and in particular to the noted Daniel Webster, who was Secretary from 1850 to 1853, Mr. Cass commented upon the foreign and domestic state of the Papal States with no small sympathy and understanding. He sympathized with the attempts at reform but criticized severely many officials of the Papal Government and the attitude of the Roman clergy generally, which seemed to him bigoted and unprogressive. Such matters as the definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin in 1854 and the furor caused by the setting up of the hierarchy of England in 1850 were discussed and commented upon. It seemed for a time that relations between the

two countries might become strained by the "Bedini Incident". Monsignor Bedini, Titular Archbishop of Thebes, was appointed Apostolic Nuncio at the Imperial Court of Brazil. On his way to this post, he was commissioned to pay a complimentary visit to the President of the United States in the name of the Sovereign Pontiff. He bore a personal letter to the President from Pius IX. He was also instructed to visit various parts of the United States, and no doubt, had various commissions to carry out in the dioceses he visited; things of purely ecclesiastical interest. Although received well in Washington, his visit became the object of ferocious attack by anti-Catholic forces, who saw in it a subtle attack on American freedom and religious liberty. The "ex-priest", Gavazzi, attacked the Archbishop, who had been an official in the Papal Government, as a tyrant and a despot. There were public demonstrations of an extremely violent character held against him in Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Covington, Cleveland, New Orleans, Baltimore, and elsewhere, and there were attempts made on his life. The American government apologized fully for these outrages, disclaiming any responsibility. Congress demanded publication of the "secret letter" of the Pope to President Pierce, and was doubtless disappointed when it was found to contain nothing beyond conventional diplomatic courtesies.

In 1854 Mr. Cass was elevated from the position of a charge d'affaires to that of a resident Minister General. He had complained about the lowliness of his position, in comparison with other foreign representatives in Rome, and the smallness of his salary, and these justified complaints had been heard. Four years later he resigned, and was succeeded by John P.

Stockton of New Jersey. Mr. Stockman was appointed in July, 1858, and had his first interview with the Holy Father the following November. In June, 1860, the Senate refused to vote any appropriation for the maintenance of the legation at Rome. This item was restored by the House, and then the Senate reconsidered. This was the first attempt to abolish the legation, and is indicative of strong sentiment against this diplomatic office. A partial reason for this feeling was the extremely uncertain position of the Papal States. Since 1848 the Papal Government had been supported by French and Austrian arms. The Pope had been placed in the position of opposing Italian liberty and unity, and his popularity in the United States had turned into definite dislike, not so much directed against the person of the Pope, but against the continued existence of the temporal power. France had allied herself with Sardinia against Austria, and Austria had been defeated. From 1850 onward the actual rule of the Papal Government was confined to the City of Rome, where it rested upon French military support. It was assumed that the annexation of the Eternal City itself by Sardinia was only a matter of time.

Mr. Stockton kept the United States well-informed on the complicated and swiftly changing political situation in Italy in numerous dispatches. The relations between the two governments was rather disturbed by several attacks on American citizens by mobs or papal troops. These were due to the prevalent anarchy, and the Roman Government eventually always apologized and paid full restitution. The most important incident of this type involved the Perkins family of Boston, who were living at a hotel in Perugia when that city was recaptured by papal troops. These

troops insulted, inconvenienced, and robbed this family and their attendants. Under the legal principle that he who issues a passport--in this case the Papal Government--guarantees the safety of those traveling in the state issuing the passport, apology and restitution were made, although the Perkins family were under no necessity of being in a town under military seige, and had previously been warned against remaining there. There were also assaults upon the American Consul, Mr. de V. Glentworth, and on two American citizens, Messrs. Hill and Hall. Mr. Glentworth had been threatened by a soldier. The consul was getting out of his carriage in front of his home, and the soldier was engaged in dispersing an unruly crowd. The soldier ignored the protests of American citizenship, and Mr. Glentworth's life was saved by a French soldier. Messrs. Hill and Hall had been walking through Rome, when they were caught in a mob, and were struck by soldiers in spite of their claiming American citizenship. These incidents were recognized by each government as the necessary accidents occurring in a city under direct military rule.

While all Italy was being conquered by Victor Emmanuel, now proclaimed King of Italy, our minister continued to report of the ordinary affairs in Rome--the visit of the Holy Father to the American College, the consideration by the Cardinal-Secretary of the claims to indemnity of the Sartori family. John Sartori, our first consul, had bought certain property in or around the year 1798. The property had belonged to religious communities, and had been seized by the revolutionary republic then in power, under French auspices, in Rome. In 1815, in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Vienna, this property

was returned to its rightful owners. The descendents of John Sartori, now American citizens living in the United States, wanted to be reimbursed for this loss. The surprising thing is that this preposterous claim, lacking either moral or legal basis, received the careful consideration of the Papal Government at this critical time.

When the Republican Party came into power in the United States for the first time, in March, 1861, Mr. Stockton, who was a Democrat, was recalled. His successor, General Rufus King, was appointed on April 16, 1861. Secretary of State William H. Seward instructed King to inform the Pope that the American government, like his own, was faced with rebellion and civil war. Just as we had never interfered or taken sides in the domestic difficulties of the Papal States, so we expected the Pope to follow the same course, in regard to our Civil War. There is more than a hint of anxiety in this instruction, for the Pope had already assured Mr. Stockton that this would be his attitude. Mr. King resigned his commission on August 6, 1861, to enter the American Army. At his suggestion, Alexander W. Randall of Wisconsin was immediately appointed to succeed him. Mr. Randall did not arrive in Rome until May 25, 1862. Knowing no language but English, he felt himself completely unfitted for the post, and was recalled.

Richard M. Blatchford of Connecticut was appointed August 11, 1861. Secretary Seward's instructions to him are interesting. The secretary reviewed the history of our diplomatic relations with the Papacy and justified their existence on grounds which are entirely valid to justify their resumption today. He regretted that we had not earlier established these

relations: "The first colonists in this country were chiefly Protestants, who not merely recognized no ecclesiastical authority of the Pope, but were very jealous lest he might exert some ecclesiastical influence which would be followed by an assumption of political power unfavorable to freedom and self-government on this continent. It was not seen that the political power of the Catholic Church was a purely foreign affair, constituting an important part of the political system of the European continent..." Then the Secretary proceeded to speak of the growth of Catholicism in the United States, how it lacked political character, and of the good which had accrued to this country through diplomatic representation at the Holy See. He then commented on the future of the temporal power, and assured the new minister that our government had no interest of policy in regard to this question.

Very little occurred during Mr. Blatchford's administration. Mr. J. C. Hooker was recognized as "quasi-secretary" of the legation, and an informal offer of Pius IX to mediate in the Civil War was received without comment. On October 6, 1863, our minister resigned, and was succeeded by General King, who had now left the Army.

Mr. King was received by the Pope on January 28, 1864. Some time previously the Confederate representative in Europe, A. Dudley Mann, visited the Pope to express the thanks of Jefferson Davis for open letters which the Pope had sent to the Archbishops of New York and New Orleans, asking them to strive for peace. In reply, Pius had written a letter to Mr. Davis, addressing him as "President of the Confederate States". This was regarded rightly by our government as a title of courtesy,

but the southerners were hailing it as the first foreign recognition of their position. The State Department requested Mr. King to inform the Pope that the South was fighting to perpetuate slavery, and that the American government was highly appreciative of the patriotic services of Archbishop John Hughes of New York. This he did. The Archduke Maximilian of Austria and his wife arrived April 18, 1864, to receive the blessing of the Holy Father before leaving for Mexico. Minister King attended the reception given for them, for which action the Secretary of State severely rebuked him.

Our Civil War continued to have repercussions in Rome. Mr. Stillman, our consul, accused Hooker, the Secretary of the American Legation, with being a Confederate sympathizer, and being in league with the Southern interests who were working for Papal recognition of the Confederacy. A Kentucky priest was writing a series of articles in the official Papal newspaper, Osservatore Romano, attacking the North as a government favoring the Italian anti-clericals and revolutionists. The American State Department became concerned about "a person in Montreal who claimed to have in his possession a written recognition (on parchment, by the Pope) of the so-called Southern Confederacy". The Papal authorities had no knowledge of this, had written no letter on parchment. Bishop Lynch of Charleston, South Carolina, and a supporter of the Confederacy, was in Rome, and was received as a bishop rather than as a diplomatic representative, but was still the cause of anxiety to our State Department. Bishop Lynch had succeeded in stirring up anti-American sentiment in Ireland on the charge that Irish immigrants were being "slaughtered like dogs" in the Northern

armies. Although accredited to the Papacy as a diplomatic representative of the Confederacy, he made no impression there.

In January, 1865, there appeared in the New York Tribune an attack on the legation at Rome, written by Sidney Snow. Although it extended only to the personnel of the legation, it probably contributed to the unpopularity of this post. The State Department forwarded a request from Father John McMullen and a Father John Norris of the Chicago Chancery that Dr. Dunne, the Vicar-General of Chicago, be named Bishop of Debuque.

John H. Surratt, who had been implicated in the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, had enlisted in the Papal Zouaves under the name of Watson. He was imprisoned by the Papal Government awaiting instructions from Washington. Although he escaped, he was recaptured and brought to the United States for trial.

It became quite obvious in 1867 that Rome would soon be absorbed into the Kingdom of Italy. The foreign troops protecting Rome had been withdrawn, and all of Italy save Rome was now under Victor Emmanuel. In January, 1867, the Papacy was denounced in the New York Times for having forced the closing of the American Protestant Church in Rome. Other papers took up this charge, and it was discussed in Congress with a view to breaking diplomatic relations. The Legation in Rome cabled the State Department that this was entirely untrue, and the State Department forwarded this information to Congress. In January, 1867, there was a debate in Congress in which it was charged that the Pope had recognized the Southern Rebels, that the Roman government was bigoted in its conduct toward Protestants, that there was no particular necessity for such a post. Several

other speakers defended the Papacy, and mentioned the close and friendly relations shown recently in the Surratt Case. But the amendment, "No money hereby appropriated shall be paid for the support of the United States legation at Rome or for the future expenses of such a legation.," was passed by the Senate, 82-18.² (10)

Mr. King made a formal and able protest to the State Department. He mentioned the ungracious action of this abrupt and undignified withdrawal of recognition from a state with which we had very friendly relations, and which had recently (the Surratt Case) extended us an unusual courtesy. The reasons given we know to be false; not only was the American Protestant Church still in operation, but we had been specially privileged in having this church outside the embassy building, as Papal Law required. As a general revolution was imminent, American self-interest required the continuance of the legation. If this action was a pretext to recognize the right of the Kingdom of Italy to seize the Papal States, it would have been better to do this openly. Finally, he pointed out the unworthiness of cutting off the revenue of the legation, rather than breaking diplomatic relations formally, if this would be considered necessary by the American Government. (11)

The government suggested to Mr. King that the post was not abolished, and that he might remain at his post without compensation if he wished; in which case the matter might be rectified by the next Congress. Mr. King was not a man of means, and therefore was forced to resign on January 1, 1868. One interesting result was that the American Protestants lost their right to have services in Rome due to the withdrawal of the ministry. General King had to leave without any formal notice

to the Papal authorities, or any statement of American policy. He was at loss as to what manner to terminate his trust, and, so irregular was the procedure, the State Department could give him no advice. In the remaining two years of the Papal States, our consul handled all affairs, as was done before 1848. (12)

The importance of these diplomatic relations lies in the precedent and principle they established. They obviously established a precedent for formal diplomatic relations with the Papacy. Much good obviously flowed from these relations during the twenty years of their existence, and we were at all times treated with great courtesy and respect by the Papal Government. The principles upon which these relations lie could again be invoked with equal justice for a resumption of these relations. As is contained in the instructions to our first minister, we were represented to the Papacy, not as to a religious institution, but as to a secular institution enjoying great prestige, power, influence, and moral and spiritual authority. The commercial considerations no longer exist, but they were never of sufficient importance to justify diplomatic representation. The Vatican State is truly an independent state, in many ways more influential and important than the Papal States of the last century. During a portion of our relations, the territory under Papal rule amounted only to the City of Rome, so there would not be too great a difference in the size of the old Papal States and modern Vatican City. But, without controversy, it may be asserted that a close examination of the history of our diplomatic relations with the Papacy is a necessary prerequisite to discussions concerning the advisability of resuming these relations. ~~(13)~~

FOOTNOTES

1. Stock, Leo Francis, "American Consuls to the Papal States," 1797-1870", Catholic Historical Review, XV., (1929), p. 233.
2. Stock, Leo Francis, "The United States at the Court of Pius IX.," Catholic Historical Review, III., (1923), p. 103.
3. Stock, Leo Francis, "American Consuls to the Papal States," 1797-1870", Catholic Historical Review, XV., (1929), p.236.
4. Stock, Leo Francis, op. cit., p. 238.
5. Stock, Leo Francis, "The United States at the Court of Pius IX.," Catholic Historical Review, III., (1923), pp. 103-105.
6. Stock, Leo Francis, "American Consuls to the Papal States," 1797-1870", Catholic Historical Review, XV., (1929), pp. 245-246.
7. Stock, Leo Francis, "The United States at the Court of Pius IX.," Catholic Historical Review, XV., (1929), p. 104.
8. Stock, Leo Francis, op. cit., p. 107.
9. Stock, Leo Francis, op. cit., p. 108.
10. Stock, Leo Francis, United States Ministers to the Papal States (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1933), p. 420.
11. Stock, Leo Francis, op. cit., pp. 420-424.
12. Stock, Leo Francis, op. cit., pp. 426-435.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Stock, Leo Francis, United States Ministers to the Papal States (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1933)

Fink, F. A., The Church in United States History, (Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor Press, n.d.)

Gilday, Peter, Rt. Rev., The Life of Archbishop Carroll, Ch. 13

Stock, Leo Francis, "The United States at the Court of Pius IX., Catholic Historical Review, III., (1923), pp. 103 - 122.

Stock, Leo Francis, "The Empress of Mexico Visits Rome," America, XXVII., (1927), pp. 226-227.

Stock, Leo Francis, "American Consuls to the Papal States, 1797-1870," Catholic Historical Review, XV., (1929), pp. 233-251.

Thorning, Joseph F., Rev., "Catholic Participation in the Diplomacy of the Southern Confederacy," Catholic Historical Review, XVI., (1930), pp.1-18.

Stock, Leo Francis, "An American Consul Joins the Papal Zouaves," Catholic World, CXXXII, (1930), pp. 146-150.

