

HERSHEY VS. CARROLL.

Rev. Hershey Says the New York Independent is Proven Wrong.

President Lincoln on Papal Interference—Dr. Hershey's Third Open Letter to Carroll.

To Rev. H. R. Carroll, LL. D., Religious Editor New York Independent:
My Dear Sir.—I addressed my second letter to you two weeks since; during the interim I have been too busy with pressing professional duties to give attention to the interesting controversy into which you have forced me. I now address myself, most seriously, to your gravest misrepresentation of history, and most culpable denial of fact. I am laboring under a great surprise ever since your misleading editorial of March 19. What sort of a motive could actuate such wholly inaccurate statements as you wrote? And the surprise becomes still greater when I reflect that you used, as an occasion to do this favor to a designing Romanism in our country, my statement in the Boston Standard, which rests upon such diplomatic and historic fact, that I had not supposed any intelligent man would think of making a denial. Why, I should as soon consider reliable the Cuban war news, which comes to us via Madrid, as statements in your department of the Independent. Fair and just men will have nothing but words of censure for public writers who will deliberately pervert history. I wrote this paragraph in my Standard article:

The president (Lincoln) about the same period of peril, directed Secretary Seward to direct our minister at Rome to inform the pope that this country would confidently expect no interference from foreign sources at the time of our internal troubles.

To this you reply, with strange disregard for the facts, or in ignorance of them:

We had no minister at Rome until Rome became the capital of united Italy, which was several years after the close of our civil war. Even if true, what would it amount to? England, France, Spain and other countries recognized the belligerency of the southern confederacy two years earlier.

Elsewhere in your editorial you refer to the "mendacious charge that the pope had recognized the southern confederacy," and that to "revive these slanders in the face of the facts" that you had disclosed, "is to deliberately bear false witness." In my article I had no thought of reminding anyone of the pope's recognition of the confederacy, but since you have made the connection, it is just as well to consider the whole case, especially as you seem to be laboring under the idea that you had, at some prior time, proven that the pope never did anything of the kind. When the evidence is in, I suspect that you may feel that you have been playing the part of "that false witness," but I am prepared to mention that you have in your editorial, and upon former occasions, been "deliberately bearing false witness," or else, like most of the Roman Catholic papers, you write without caring enough about the facts to examine into them.

Now, sir, address yourself to a consideration of the facts. You tell your readers that we "had no minister at Rome until Rome became the capital of United Italy, several years after the war." Do you deliberately falsify? I refer you to the documents of the United States government, in which you will find the personnel of our diplomatic and consular relations with the pontifical or papal states, the capital of which was Rome. As early as 1855 our resident minister at the papal court was Hon. Lewis Cass, Jr., of Michigan, with larger salary than the minister to England. In June, 1858, he was succeeded by Hon. John P. Stockton of New Jersey. In August of 1862 his successor was appointed in the person of Hon. R. M. Blotchford of New York, and he was succeeded in October, 1863, by the Hon. Rufus King of the same state. As to our consul, W. J. Stillman was appointed in September, 1861, and succeeded by E. C. Cushman in February, 1865. This covers the war period, and several years before.

I see again, how you have fallen into the error of surmising a fact from a vague rumor floating about in your memory. The fact is, our diplomatic relations with the papal states had lapsed for a period, I think, of about five years, just prior to 1870, because congress refused to make the appropriation of money to support the mission. The legation had been kept up



UNCLE SAM.—"Columbia, this place is infested with those critters today. They are amusing to look at, but I am inclined to the belief that unless there is a little of the spirit of Seventy-six displayed pretty soon, they will think they own the Country."

for years by the Democratic and Whig parties, and was supported during the war by the Republican party. And the attempt was made in 1870, during the Vatican council and through the influence of the Roman Catholic lobby, to return to the custom, Mr. Brooks, member of congress from New York, advocated sending a minister to Rome again, on the ground of "the temporal power and relations of Rome." And yet you write with the Roman party, and say no claim is made for any temporal power for the pope. Upon the 19th of May, 1870, Hon. Godlove S. Orth from Indiana, an early political friend of my father's, said in the house: "I am opposed to re-establishing this mission at Rome, which was discontinued five years ago." From this it is clear the appropriation was cut off in 1865, which was after the close of the war.

You remember—no, I am reminded that you do not remember these things very well—so I may tell you how the appropriation for the legation at Rome came to be cut off. It came about as a sequence to papal interference with the religious rights of Americans at the residence of the United States minister at Rome. The habit had been formed of holding religious service at the legation residence. Mr. Cass was a Protestant, and he saw no reason why he should not worship God as he wanted to. A Methodist minister, not of the kind that you are, sir, was invited to conduct Sabbath worship. The pope ordered him without the city walls. The paper of your admirable friend, Archbishop Hughes, said this at the time, "that upon the first convert being made, the minister would be kicked out of Rome, though Mr. Cass, the United States ambassador, should bundle up his traps and follow him."

Several years later, Mr. Cass was sent to the senate from Michigan. He addressed that body on the outrageous intolerance of the papal court against the living and the dead in the city of Rome, and some weeks later, when the vote was being taken on the appropriation for foreign legations, some senator moved that the legation at Rome be left without an appropriation, and that began the five-year interim to which Congressman Orth referred to in 1870.

So much for your denial that we had a legation at Rome prior to 1870.

Now, about Mr. Lincoln instructing the United States minister to Rome to warn the pope to keep his hands off. You remember that early in the war Mr. Davis had sent a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic by the name of Lynch to Europe, and that this man Lynch tarried a great while at the court of Rome. Following this, Mr. Lincoln became so impressed with the baneful influence of the papacy upon the patriotism of the north, that, in addition to the ordinary diplomatic methods,

he at one time sent a special envoy to Rome to counteract that influence. If you will examine the diplomatic correspondence of that period, you will find that as early as April 29, 1861, the president has the secretary of state write our minister at Rome, accredited to the court of the pontifical states, that "the government of the pope is surrounded by elements of political revolution," and that as the United States will not interfere in the domestic affairs of the pope, it is confidently expected that he will not interfere in the affairs of the United States. The state department had sufficient evidence of papal intentions, else this instruction to the United States minister at Rome is without explanation. If you will look into the life of Secretary of State Seward, by his son, Frederick W., you will find that in 1864 our department of state gave instructions to the United States minister at Rome to counteract the influence of the pope, and to say to Cardinal Antonelli, the pope's secretary of state, that the rebel course ought not to obtain, and "could not win, even with the declared favor of the church." This is documentary evidence, and you will permit me to commend to your reflection Lord Acton's declaration on the value of such evidence. "History," says he, "to be above evasion or dispute, must stand on documents, not on opinions." The issues of our state department at Washington, and the biography of Secretary Seward, make your opinion of very light weight.

I am not done, Doctor. You say it is a "mendacious charge," that the pope gave any official countenance to the southern confederacy. And even if he had, other nations recognized the belligerent rights of the southern cause. You do seem to be very sensitive to any alleged slander against the foolish old man at Rome, who claims (see Smith on Canon Law, authorized by Leo XIII.) to be the only channel through which God will have anything to do with the regulation of earthly affairs. And to spare the pope you would slander history and fact. Now, against the bold, bare frontage of fact, how appears your statement that the pope did not give any recognition of the southern confederacy? I ask you to confront these several weighty facts:

1. The American congress had information placing this beyond your power to dispute. Mr. Dawes, of Massachusetts, making a speech on the attitude of the government of the Roman church, in congress, May 19, 1870, said: "It took sides with the enemies of our country in the late war, and recognized the southern confederacy."

2. The attitude of the papacy during our civil war was a source of anxiety to our government, and to thoughtful men. The general trend of the Roman church was unfriendly. Read this high authority in Butler's "Mexico in

Transition," a valuable work, which I suppose will be no longer issued by the Methodist Book concern if you are elevated to a position in that publishing house; for, of course, you would poison that as quickly as you have the Independent.

3. Please read an editorial in Harper's Weekly for February 9, 1867, which says in regard to the papal government, that it was the "only government in the world to recognize the southern confederacy." And, while you are at it, turn to the same paper for June 29, 1867, and read this: "The pope was the first and only authority which recognized the southern confederacy." And you understand that Harper's Weekly of that day was more reliable than the New York Independent of this day.

4. It was during the war, when the pope was cunningly conspiring to bring advantage to his church, through the disturbances in the United States and Mexico, viz.: December 8, 1864, that he issued that celebrated political encyclical in which he said that "the best condition of society is that in which the power of the laity is compelled to inflict the penalties of law upon violators of the Catholic faith." This doctrine Mr. Bingham condemned on the floor of congress, declaring it to be an attempt to fetter the freedom of conscience, and the freedom of speech, and uttered in the interest of universal despotism.

5. Do I understand that you deny that the pope wrote the president of the southern confederacy, addressing him in his official capacity, as the head of the confederacy? I have seen this letter. It is, or was, when I examined it, among the abandoned property of the confederacy, in the treasury department at Washington. With that letter was originally a note from a confederate papal agent at the court of Rome (Dudley Mann). In his transmitting note Mr. Mann says: "It will live (the pope's letter to Davis) forever in story as the production of the first potentate who formally recognized your official position, and accorded to one of the diplomatic representatives of the confederate states an audience in an established court palace, like that of St. James on the Tuilleries." It appears perfectly clear from this that the confederate government was enjoying diplomatic relations with the court. Several foreign governments issued acts of belligerency. That was saying a state of war existed. You seem to see no difference between this and a diplomatic correspondence. To address a letter officially to the head of an insurgent government, as the representative head of such government, is to recognize the standing of such government. This is a well-known principle of diplomacy. When the pope began his letter to Mr. Davis: "Illustrious and Honorable President," he gave

that official recognition I am writing about.

6. Read the "Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government," by Jefferson Davis, and you will find the expression of the confederacy saying this: "Napoleon and the pope were both anxious to do more than recognize the southern confederacy." Is this not rather high authority as to the way in which Pope Pius IX., pontifical head of the Roman church, and Mr. Jefferson Davis, president of the southern confederacy, understood each other?

7. It was my pleasure, a few years ago, to spend a night with a cultivated old gentleman in his Virginia home. He had been a chaplain in the confederate army, serving, if I remember, in General Gordon's corps, and in the exigency of battle, sometimes on his staff. He told me that he distinctly remembered that the pope was carrying on some sort of negotiations, that it was generally known and generally regretted, and that the letter which has been discovered (the one I refer to) was not the first communication.

8. I must suggest that you read Mr. Robert Reid Harrison, the eminent southern author and historical writer, who says in writing about the cause that was lost: "In this colossal war the confederate states never received friendly words from a power claiming sovereignty, except from the pontiff of the Roman church to Jefferson Davis, president of the confederate states."

9. Once more I refer you to an article I have had sent me from the Rambler, a Roman Catholic paper (I think) of England. Sorry I cannot give date of issue, but you can look it up. In that article is this paragraph: "The south had the assurance from the pope that the Jesuits, bishops and priests would help them. The pope of Rome was the only crowned prince in the whole world who recognized the southern confederacy."

10. Now, Doctor, add to all these statements of what has been currently held in great Britain and our country, on the attitude of the papacy to the confederacy, and to the documentary evidence, the fact that Davis had a high Roman ecclesiastic—Archbishop Lynch—at the court of Rome, for the specific purpose of diplomatic negotiations. I confess I do not trust the Roman priestly agent on any political mission. Hence, I have no higher opinion of the trustworthiness of Archbishop Hughes on a political mission than of Archbishop Lynch. The difference between a papal priest and Protestant minister is this: The minister can forget his denominational relations in performing his political duties; the priest, never. I recommend to your consideration the testimony of the great English law commentator, Blackstone, who says that "it took centuries to protect and perfect the nation

against the rapacity [and schemes of the priests to avoid the statutes."

It was this same pope, about the same time, who was conspiring, through his agents, to destroy the rights of the Mexican people and erect in that country, only separated from us by the Rio Grande river, a papal empire, wholly governed by his law. It was this same pope who formed a conspiracy to centralize the government of the independent Italian states, under himself, as the sole temporal head.

As ex-Secretary of the Navy Thompson has forcibly put it, "a man must be stupid if he cannot, and willful if he will not see that the doctrines announced by Pius IX. and Leo XIII. violate all the fundamental principles of our government, and which may be rightfully resisted whenever the pope finds it expedient to so command."

Now, sir, these weighty words of men better situated to know, and better experienced to judge upon these matters than ourselves, deserve your reflection, as they have had mine.

In the face of this imposing array of testimony, will you still say that President Lincoln did an "absurd" thing if he sent a communication to Archbishop Hughes, directing his attention to his responsibility towards the New York rioters. I question if you are in a situation to dismiss any act of President Lincoln with the judgment of absurdity flung at it. Such keen insight into international relations during a time of war, when the enemy had secret agents working in all parts of Europe; such superior wisdom in estimating the spirit of men and movements; such straightforward and statesmanlike action, when his mind was once made up; such a clear and quite sublime course of judgment in directing the affairs of state during these four years of terrific strife, and no less stupendous peril, were exercised by President Lincoln as, perhaps, not elsewhere in our whole administrative history. It is altogether reasonable to suppose that Mr. Lincoln understood more about the danger threatening from the Tiber than yourself, and it ill becomes you or I to say that if he did this or that it was "manifestly absurd."

It is worth while for me to give, in this connection, a paragraph to show that the disposition of the mind of Mr. Davis was not unlikewise soil for papal intrigues to work in.

Davis was placed in a Roman Catholic school when he was seven years old—and a monks' school at that—and against the consent of his mother. This monastic school was under the Dominicans. I have no space here to discuss what the ethical effect of Dominican training is on a certain type of mind. You remember Mrs. Davis testified how her husband felt towards the pope, and that the pope had written letters and sent his picture to Mr. Davis. You understand as well as I do, that the sole interest of the pope in Mr. Davis centred in the fact that he was at the head of the rebellious attempt to destroy the American union. You remember that when the Christian people of France and England united in a paper of sympathy to the Christian people of the United States, expressing their hope for the cause of the union, a message concurred in by some 800 ministers of France and more than 4,000 in England, there was not a Roman Catholic priest or bishop among them—all Protestants, every one.

What more shall I say at this point? If you still hold, in perfect candor of conscience, that American civilization of 200 years' standing, has no case to make out against the papal party for an unfriendly attitude, a treasonable course of action, and repeated acts of political conspiracy against our system of constitutionalism and free institutions, then, in the interest of the papal cause you hold dear, I invite you to a joint debate, early next fall, in the city of New York or in Boston. I will furnish free a large and pleasant church, capable of holding 3,000 people, and will guarantee a respectful hearing by that number of people.

Now, my dear doctor, giving you time to reflect over the evil course into which you have fallen, before addressing my last letter to you, I beg to assure you of the kindest personal feelings. Yours for historical accuracy,
SCOTT F. HERSHEY.

BOSTON, Mass., May 9, 1896.

Stars and Stripes For Church Spire.

SANDUSKY, O., May 31.—The new Columbus Avenue Congregational church was dedicated to-day by the Rev. Charles S. Mills, and at the evening service an American flag was presented to the church, which will be raised on the spire during the hours of worship. This, it is said, will be the only church in the United States over which the Stars and Stripes will wave.

MARK OUR great offer, then send the paper to a friend.