

Archbishop Hughes and the Question of Ireland, 1829–1862

By Charles P. Connor

Charles P. Connor is preparing for the priesthood at the North American College, the Vatican. He has a Ph.D. in History from Fordham University, a Ph.D. in Philosophy from the University of Louvain, Belgium, and an S.T.B. in Theology from Gregorian University, Rome. The following article was part of his Fordham dissertation The American Catholic Political Position at Mid Century: Archbishop Hughes as a Test Case and originally appeared in the journal of the American Catholic Historical Association.

John Hughes' earliest biographer, a contemporary and a friend, captured well the dual loyalty New York's first Archbishop hoped to inculcate in his ever increasing flock:

No one could accuse Bishop Hughes of forgetting the land of his birth; but he wished the naturalized Irishmen of the United States to regard themselves as American citizens—not as exiles; and he depreciated everything that tended to separate them from the rest of the people. . . . "Never forget your country," was his advice to the immigrant. . . . "But let this love of old Ireland affect you only individually. In your social and political relations you must become merged in the country of your adoption."¹

From the days of his earliest priestly labors in Philadelphia, until his death in 1864, Archbishop Hughes would consistently advise Catholic immigrants to assimilate themselves politically, socially and culturally, while at the same time maintaining those strong national qualities of positive values inherent in each race. Such an approach, he believed, would not only help America's new arrivals adapt to their environment, but would strongly influence non Catholic minds in overcoming a natural aversion to, and fear of, immigrants. The question of Ireland, that country so closely associated with mid nineteenth century Catholic immigration, and the native land of John Hughes, was a topic one found at the very core of the American Church, one with which the mind of this engaging prelate was continually preoccupied.

The winning of Catholic Emancipation bestowed the title of Liberator on Daniel O'Connell, and proved the most singularly optimistic event for the Irish in the nineteenth century. Eliminated were those laws which had debarred Catholics from the more important offices in the state, the seats of Parliament, the Tribunals, the rank of Colonel and Captain in the Army and Navy, and the various ministries in government.² For his part, Bishop Hughes saw nothing fundamentally wrong with his episcopal colleagues in Ireland remaining "on the fence" in regard to the proposed Emancipation Bill, but he did fear prospects for passage of the same might be doomed if the hierarchy maintained too low a profile. On the other hand, if emancipation should succeed, "... thousands and thousands of the higher classes in England and Ireland will be Catholic before half a century. . . ." In addition, the effects would be most productive in the United States, since the British government and writers would no longer have opportunity to justify their persecution of the Irish by "... misrepresenting the activities of the persecuted. . . ."³ The British government, headed by the Irish born Duke of Wellington, and the conservative Home Secretary, Sir Robert Peel, saw in the resounding Parlia-

mentary victory of O'Connell over Vesey Fitzgerald in 1828 an ever growing demand for Catholic equality. "Who would have thought years ago," wrote John Hughes, "that Peel, the Pharaoh of the British government, would have come out the advocate of Catholic rights. . . ."⁴

Hughes had been in the United States twelve years when Catholic Emancipation became a reality on April 13, 1829.⁵ He had fully participated in the optimism of American Catholics, recalling later the "... chimes of Protestant bells (if we can call them so) . . . ringing out notes of joy over the fact that England had at last surrendered. . . if . . . not altogether obliterated its unjust legislation. . . ."⁶ On May 31, a solemn thanksgiving service was held in Saint Augustine's Church, Philadelphia, at which the recognized priest-orator spoke. He reminded his congregation that it was Irish obstinacy in refusing, for generations, to take the prescribed parliamentary oath recognizing the spiritual supremacy of the Church of England, which accounted for the centuries of deprivation. Not surprising, with his deep loyalty to both nations, that he would assert this Irish allegiance to Rome, one which could be marvelled at by all Catholics, while at the same time cautioning his audience that the greatness of America allowed Catholics in the United States to maintain just as strong a spiritual allegiance without the unfortunate penalties the Irish had had to endure. As if to further underscore his Americanism, he concluded by reminding his compatriots in Ireland that as far as the winning of Emancipation was concerned

. . . That generous spirit of our happy country, the freest under the Sun, that spirit which lately cheered the captive onward in the enterprise, is gladdened by its success.⁷

The passage of a decade was to bring positive benefit to the Irish in public affairs, but the physical state of their country was a portent of things to come. Hughes made his first trip as a Bishop to the land of his birth in 1840.⁸ Writing to one of his priests in New York he observed that "... the persecution has ceased, but on every side you see the unhealed wounds and stripes of their martyrdom." This, however, was entirely to their credit, for had they been as "... faithless and false as their gloomy and gorgeous oppressors. . . ." there is no question mid century would have seen them reaping the benefits.⁹ It was on this trip also that Hughes had his first opportunity to meet and converse with Daniel O'Connell, the patriot whose philosophy he admired the most, and whose career he was to follow with the greatest enthusiasm.

In a world in which so many legal barriers against Catholics had been removed, it is not difficult to see how Irishmen would now take a dim view of traveling to Westminster to sit in what seemed a rather foreign legislative body. O'Connell's Repeal Association, aimed at the restoration of the Irish Parliament, had gained tremendous support in a span of three years, a fact demonstrated by the monster meeting common both in Ireland and America. This climate of events witnessed a return visit by Hughes to the Emerald Isle in 1843, the first stop on a European recruitment tour for men and women religious to staff the rapidly increasing number of parochial institutions in his Diocese. Accompanying the Bishop were his old friend, John B. Purcell, now Bishop of Cincinnati, the explorer Father Peter DeSmet, and Hughes' long time political

confidant Thurlow Weed. The foursome traveled together as far as Cork, where Weed attended Mass which the Bishop celebrated in a local convent, and then consulted in his company with the famed temperance advocate, Father Theobald Mathew. Weed had to decline the hospitality of the Bishop of Cork, in order to meet an engagement in Dublin, and it was there, on July 3, that the Albany editor, along with Hughes, had a private meeting with O'Connell. Later, the three witnessed a gathering of one hundred sixty thousand on the plain of Donnybrook, several hours of speeches, and numerous expressions of loyalty for their host.¹⁰ Such events led Hughes to comment on the perplexities which must have existed in the minds of the British cabinet Ministers, especially Peel, and although O'Connell was right, "... they have the power, and God grant that the crisis may not end in adding another blood stained chapter to the history of Ireland's misfortunes."¹¹ The only consolation to be derived from this, was that as long as such a lack of national representation existed, Ireland would remain England's "weakness and shame" in the eyes of the rest of the world. This fight would ultimately be won, the Bishop felt, if the basic tenets of O'Connell's philosophy were followed; namely, that the struggle for national independence must not be one which is fought on a battlefield, but rather, by logic, persuasion, and the sheer force of will.¹² However commendable this might be, opponents of Repeal were willing to go to any length before they would yield. By O'Connell's death in 1847, it was clear that his movement had failed; Ireland would continue to be governed by the British Parliament.¹³

In spite of Peel's government declaring its opposition to an Irish legislature, Bishop Hughes believed there were "two understandings and two wills." Further, the British government was aware now more than ever, he felt, that whatever she considered good, Ireland considered evil; her friends were Ireland's enemies; her humiliations, Ireland's comfort. Portraying what one contemporary biographer has termed his dual patriotism,¹⁴ Hughes declares to Thurlow Weed the true Irish-American relationship:

She hates England, she loves America. She is chained to the one by the chains of civil, but not spontaneous allegiance. She is attracted to the other, by the higher allegiance of human sympathy and human nature.¹⁵

The failure of O'Connell's Repeal Association, in the mind of Hughes, was due to far more than the rigorous attachment to constitutional principles inherent in the Liberator's approach. A newer faction had arisen, whose respect for ordered structure was far less than O'Connell's, and the younger patriots, dubbed by O'Connell himself as "Young Irelanders," were the individuals Hughes held responsible for nearly all the ills befalling his native land. Once arrived in the United States, they were the same group who perpetrated secret societies among Irish workers, fostered a type of nationalism totally inconsistent with the Bishop's Americanizing program, and presented the Irish immigrant in a largely reckless, irresponsible manner to native Americans.

Hughes' private reflections on Young Ireland vividly portray these individuals sowing seeds of discord, by viewing Daniel O'Connell as a large pyramid, upon which they ascended.¹⁶ Many of them, "more numerous in the aggregate, but individually considered, much less important," climbed up the great colossus of Ireland, breaking it down not by the weight of a single person, but by the sheer force of numbers. This compelled

Hughes to observe that "Mr. Gulliver of Ireland was vanquished by the new Lilliputians."¹⁷ Having done so, these individuals, who would never have been heard of had their names not been connected with O'Connell, could not conceive why each of them should not be as great a political leader as their chief.¹⁸

Central to this story was the way these young patriots played directly into the hands of the British. The home government realized they would serve a far greater purpose than her standing armies would ever have. Consequently, troops were withdrawn, the British "... allowing rope enough to the Young Irelanders to hang O'Connell, or themselves, or both..."¹⁹ With this in mind, Britain gave a certain degree of latitude to that which at any other time would have been construed treasonable. "At this period," he wrote, "if the Lilliputians had been faithful to Gulliver, the providence of the Almighty would have supplied the deficit of what was necessary to recover Irish independence." Hughes' generalizations do tend to be rather sweeping, but he does show quite clearly that the cause of division is in no way attributable to O'Connell; rather, to those of whom "many... had genius, few had experience, all were eloquent, and each was selfishly conceited."²⁰

In his account of the arrests, convictions and deportations of these individuals who "... were described in colloquial parlance as the wind boys of Ireland..." Hughes felt the entire affair had been controlled by London. The government decided all the harm the Young Irelanders could inflict on their country had been accomplished, their usefulness was at an end, and prompt measures must be enacted against them. Penal servitude in Australia would not render them incapable of new "inflations," however, and the next best alternative to the Emerald Isle seemed to be New York City. Here these "Irish felons" could find thousands of their compatriots to prey upon, and build the very wall of separation Hughes was trying to dismantle. "What remains of this melancholy eruption of ferocious and ungrateful patriotism is a farce and a tragedy," the Bishop declared, "the tragic part is unhappily borne by suffering in Australia, the comic turns up in this country, and to a great extent in this city."²¹

Daniel O'Connell had always acted on two fundamentals: a firm adherence to the faith and practice of the Catholic Church, and a strong belief in the rights of all denominations. "For more than a quarter of a century O'Connell piped," Hughes said, "but the Protestants with rare exceptions, and particularly the Orangemen of the North would not dance." To his credit, O'Connell never ceased articulating Catholic rights, yet when he became vocal on such subjects, the tone became somewhat unmusical in the ears of his young friends. "Childhood and youth are naturally and proverbially impatient of delay, and hence by some it was thought that if this reference to Catholic interests were at once excluded... the Protestant patriots of Ireland would no longer have pretext to hold aloof." All that had been accomplished by the exclusion of any Catholic reference, the Bishop believed, was the fostering of a spirit of religious indifference, a spirit which could lead, if it had not done so already, to infidelity. "This was the real difficulty on which the Association split," he observed, "and not the silly and trifling disputes about the morality of shedding a drop of human blood." And what had been the result? The refusal of the Irish Protestants to join their organization. "The vile and stupid blarney, the fulsome praises, the false eulogisms, the base flatteries which Young Irelanders poured forth on the Protestants of the North were all in vain," and the reason was quite simple: Northern Protestants

were too shrewd to place the slightest confidence in a set of young political radicals who had betrayed "... the strongest party, and the wisest leader that Ireland ever had to boast of."²²

A further indictment from Hughes was found in his statement that the leaders of Young Ireland, now in New York, were actively recruiting members for at least two or three secret Irish societies. These rival groups vied with each other to place a majority of their members in the sectional distribution of New York's public works, railroads and canals, with the inevitable result of rifts, quarrels and bloodshed. Happily, Hughes could take consolation in the fact that the guidance of the Church had been able to restrain the majority of Irish from joining such societies.²³ After turning up in "this our free and happy land," many of the Irish Hughes was criticizing mistook the greeting they received on these shores, which the very nature of American freedom demanded, to be a tacit approval of their actions in Ireland. As a case in point, the Bishop revealed in a pastoral letter that he had recently discovered a document widely circulated among American Irish, suggesting they rush into an unlawful combination and conspiracy under the pleas of revolutionizing the country of their birth.²⁴ The inevitable result of such plans was the entangling of simple minded souls into a secret conspiracy "... condemned by the laws of the religion they profess, and by the laws of the country in which they live."²⁵ Hughes made it quite clear that American citizens were prohibited from conspiring clandestinely, with secret oaths, to benefit any foreign government with which the United States was at peace. New York's Bishop wrote, rather sadly it seems, that such Irish Americans easily made themselves objects of suspicion and political aversion; "neither can we disguise from ourselves that much of the ill feeling which now exists in the public mind has arisen from them."²⁶

Hughes did not attribute every problem in the Emerald Isle to one political group. Ireland was, after all, engaged in the worst natural disaster she had experienced in centuries, that which drove hundreds of thousands to America. Under the auspices of the General Committee for the Relief of the Suffering Poor of Ireland, the Bishop delivered a precise, well reasoned lecture on "The Antecedent Causes of the Irish Famine," at the Broadway Tabernacle in March, 1847. Using a thematic approach, he traced incompleteness of conquest, bad government, and a defective system of social economy as the most important particulars for a complete understanding of the malaise.²⁷ Further, Hughes was not above a limited involvement in the general euphoria pervading New York City during the 1848 Irish revolutionary movement. Meetings were held twice weekly in Vauxhall Garden to promote the cause of Irish independence, Horace Greeley being particularly conspicuous for this activity. Hughes finally agreed to attend one such meeting, much to the consternation of his secretary, James Roosevelt Bayley.²⁸ Any initial vacillation quickly vanished as he "came forward amid tremendous cheering," and proceeded to address the supporters of independence, careful all the while to distinguish between support for independence in the abstract, and direct encouragement of Young Ireland. "The policy that has precipitated this issue ... would not have been my policy," he declared, "I believe that all the powers of reason have not been exhausted." He then placed on the table his donation of five hundred dollars, "for a shield, not a sword."²⁹ So as not to be misinterpreted, the Bishop followed this lecture with a strong denunciation of Young Ireland in the editorial pages of the *Freeman's Journal*, a Catholic weekly, which at this point in time, was his official organ.³⁰ In

addition, Hughes later explained to the president of the directory to whom the fund had been entrusted, that since division seemed to be the one stumbling block to Irish independence for seven centuries, "I took sides for the first time in my life, publicly, and, I might add, against my own convictions. . . I threw myself with all the influence I might possess into the scale of a desperate experiment." No doubt this "experiment" was all the more noble in Hughes' opinion, because of the fund's director, Robert Emmet, as well as three prominent New York Catholics, the lawyer and Presidential nominee Charles O'Connor, and two with whom he had worked on the school question, James White and Felix Ingolsby.³¹

Hughes' ongoing struggle with Thomas D'Arcy McGee, editor of a militant publication named after the well known Dublin journal, *The Nation*, was proof that he consistently separated himself from the radical fringe of Irishmen whose virtues were being extolled in New York. McGee's writings had so angered the Bishop that he penned a series of letters to the twenty-four old editor, asserting such to be infidel and anti-Catholic. The sharp, biting responses of the young Irishman published in the *Freeman's Journal* went so far as to threaten an investigation of what he called the mal-administration of the Diocese of New York.³² For reasons somewhat unclear, McGee was prompt to back down and even went so far as to promise Hughes to "... take every means in my power to avoid giving him or the other pastors of the Catholic Church any reason to complain of injuring our holy religion by my writing or other subjects."³³ Following this, however, McGee left New York for Boston, where he began publishing *The American Celt*, the same type of divisive sheet as *The Nation*. Following a location of some years in Buffalo, it appeared, in 1856, that he intended to again take up residence in New York. Hughes, by now an Archbishop, seems to have reached the point of total exasperation, as he announced to the faithful of his Archdiocese that the publication of *The American Celt* was "... in opposition to our judgement, and in defiance of our episcopal authority."³⁴

Further examples might be found in the exchange between Hughes, the Catholic Irishman Thomas Francis Meagher, and the Protestant Irishman John Mitchel. Meagher had given an address in New York which the Archbishop felt strongly conveyed the notion Catholics were unqualified for republican freedom and civil liberty.³⁵ Meagher, for his part, denied ever having made such a statement but did admit that that which Hughes could have construed as such came from a sentence decrying religious intolerance on the part of Catholics. Such bigotry, said Meagher, would render them unfit to be citizens of a free state, and any tendency toward the same ought to be vigorously met before it became totally destructive of civil liberty.³⁶ If Meagher's reply somewhat placated the Archbishop, the writings of his partner did not. Meagher and John Mitchel had established *The Citizen* in December, 1853. No sooner had they done so, than Mitchel began a series of letters to the Archbishop, containing personal criticism and various and sundry denunciations of the Church of Rome. Hughes could refrain no longer, publicly criticized Mitchel's intolerance, and stated that the failure of Young Ireland "... caused every Irishmen from Maine to Texas. . . to blush and hang down his head for shame," adding that in New York, professional men and merchants were afraid to meet their neighbors, "lest they should be jeered at for having sympathized with such a set of gasconaders. . ."³⁷ Needless to say, Mitchel did not view events in a similar fashion, and replied that the failure "... is not due to cowardice on the part of those

you call Young Irishmen, but to the treachery and meanness of the Irish Catholic priests."³⁸ Taking things a step further, Mitchel seemed to defy totally what the Archbishop stood for when he wrote the only reason Hughes was in the habit of speaking about Irish nationality or patriotism was "... for the purpose of keeping your flock together as an Irish power, and perpetuating that monstrosity called the Irish vote."³⁹

McGee, Meagher and Mitchel had a common bond. They all espoused what Hughes was fond of calling an "extreme Irishism" which would totally separate such individuals from the mainstream of American life. Such an attempt could be accomplished on a much larger scale, should plans to form Irish settlements in the western United States become reality.⁴⁰ While a few distinct Irish colonies were in existence,⁴¹ a large scale movement to attract Irish settlement in the West never materialized until the Buffalo Convention of 1856, a gathering of seventy-two laymen and thirty-two clerics, calling itself the Irish Catholic Convention for the Promotion of Actual Settlements in North America, and resolving that men of means (wherever one might find them in the Irish community) would buy Western lands and sell them in lots to the poorer Irish. Hughes looked upon the entire scheme as impractical, a promotional venture painting a wonderful picture of an Irishman owning vast acres of Western land, but failing to mention how remote that land might be from the Church, school, post office, physician and the like.⁴¹ On the other hand, the Archbishop was careful to point out that while he opposed organized groups of Irish going westward, under no circumstances did he object to individuals doing such on their own initiative; in fact, he felt much positive good could accrue to a sufficiently well prepared settler.⁴³

This opposition to Western colonization assumed very real proportions in March, 1857, when a priest named Jeremiah Tracy, like Hughes a native of Tyrone, and an educational product of Emmitsburg, paid a courtesy call on the Archbishop, requesting facilities to administer the sacraments while in New York. Tracy did not mention his true reasons for visiting the city, and on the same evening, March 26, 1857, the priest addressed a huge gathering of Irishmen at the Broadway Tabernacle, describing in detail his plans for the colony of Saint Patrick in Nebraska, where Irish would be the sole inhabitants, Gaelic the spoken language, and street names evoking such familiar sounds as Dublin, Limerick, and Kilkenny. Much to the surprise of the audience, a man arose, interrupted Tracy in the middle of his speech, and began refuting him. Once his winter trappings were removed, the Archbishop was quickly recognized. Not only would the Irish be socially isolated by such a scheme, he maintained, but the foreign cast would never be removed from natives of the Emerald Isle; if they "scented the notion of towns strictly Irish," they would become "as distinct as the Mormons."⁴⁴

Hughes' final visit to the land of his birth came during the course of a diplomatic mission for the Lincoln Administration in 1862. While in Dublin, he received word that a group of nationalists desired to call on him, to express their gratitude for his having conducted funeral services for Terence B. McManus the previous year.⁴⁵ The leader of this National Brotherhood, or as they were also known, Fenians, referred to merely as the O'Donohue, acted as spokesman, and presented Hughes a testimonial replete with praise.⁴⁶ The Archbishop expressed his wish that the O'Donohue would one day be leader of a united Ireland, hastening to add that the method for an oppressed people to achieve their rights is not by "rashness and intemperate haste," but rather "patience, steadiness and resolute purpose."⁴⁷

Hughes did not realize these words fell on largely deaf ears, since the National Brotherhood was, in effect, a secret society committed in theory to violence for the perpetration of their revolutionary aims. Deeply hurt when he discovered that he had been so deceived, he wrote to various Irish newspaper editors upon his return to New York.⁴⁸ The prelate stated his belief that while all Irishmen were nationalists in the legitimate sense of the term,⁴⁹ he could not condone the purposes to which he had recently discovered this group committed. "It is well known in America and in Dublin itself," he wrote, "that I have ever opposed secret societies as the proper discharge of my duties as a prelate require me to do."⁵⁰ Hughes stated he had neither respect nor resentment for those who had been so conniving, and although a Bishop should be humble and forbearing, "he is not bound to be trampled upon by virtue of his humility."⁵¹ Indeed, Hughes could very easily forgive the country, but it was another matter to overlook totally "... the misconduct of the fellows who attempted to utilize me."⁵²



Archbishop John Hughes from *The Irish Pictorial* (Boston), 4 February 1860. Courtesy of John T. Ridge

The Archbishop never considered it his vocation to be a recruiter for would be immigrants, and just as he felt it prudent that American Irish move west on their own initiative, similar counsel prevailed for Irishmen departing their native land; such individuals should be aware of all risks, and once arrived, wary of those whose lot it was to prey on unsuspecting newcomers.⁵³ The ideal candidate for citizenship was depicted vividly:

Send us none who are drunkards—none who are bound up with secret societies in this land—give us good men—men who will do honor to their country.⁵⁴

This was the sort of Irishmen who would quickly acclimate himself. More importantly, this combination answered the question of Ireland quite clearly for John Hughes; three and one half decades of his priesthood were given to molding just such a person.

(Continued next page)

ARCHBISHOP HUGHES FOOTNOTES

- ¹ John R. G. Hassard. *Life of the Most Rev. John Hughes, D.D.* (New York: D. Appleton, 1866), pp. 311-312.
- ² For a fuller account of political events leading to Catholic Emancipation, see T.W. Moody and F.X. Martin. *The Course of Irish History* (Cork: The Mercier Press, 1967), pp. 248-255.
- ³ Hughes to John McGarry, April 9, 1832. Archives of the Archdiocese of New York. Hereafter cited as AANY. McGarry was President of Mount Saint Mary's, Emmittsburg, Maryland.
- ⁴ Hughes to John B. Purcell, April 29, 1829. AANY.
- ⁵ Hughes was currently serving as pastor of Saint Joseph's, Philadelphia.
- ⁶ Hughes to Editor of Dublin *Freeman's Journal*, December 11, 1861, in Hassard, *op. cit.*, p. 91.
- ⁷ Laurence Kehoe (ed.) *Complete Works of the Most Rev. John Hughes, D.D.* (New York: L. Kehoe, 1866), Volume I, Part I, p. 40. For a more detailed treatment of Hughes' Sermon on Catholic Emancipation, see Henry J. Browne. *Life of Archbishop John Hughes*. (Unpublished Manuscript, AANY). Chapter II, "Young Priest," pp. 29-33. Hereafter cited as Browne Mss., AANY.
- ⁸ Hughes became coadjutor to John Dubois in New York in 1838. This carried with it the right of succession.
- ⁹ Hughes to Felix Varela, June 1, 1840, in Hassard, *op. cit.*, p. 222.
- ¹⁰ Browne Mss., AANY. Chapter VII, "Diocesan Organizer," pp. 21-30. There is no evidence to indicate Hughes attended any such repeal meetings in New York.
- ¹¹ Hughes to "A Friend in America," July, 1843, in Hassard, *op. cit.*, p. 270.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, see also Kehoe, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, Part III, pp. 129-130.
- ¹³ An adequate treatment of the repeal movement and its ultimate defeat is given in Moody and Martin, *op. cit.*, pp. 255-261.
- ¹⁴ Browne Mss., AANY. Chapter VIII, "Dual Patriot."
- ¹⁵ Hughes wrote from Ford's Hotel, London, on January 21, 1846, several pages of reflections on the state of affairs in England and Ireland, as well as the nature of British society as he viewed it. He used the pseudonym "Iota" in sending them to Weed's *Albany Evening Journal*, in the hope they might be of use in some columns dealing with "...notes of foreign correspondence..." Writing to the editor a few days later, the Bishop declared, "...I would hardly choose to be known as its author—and yet, why not publish in your own way, so as to keep me safe, whatever you might think worth being published..." Hughes to Weed, January 25, 1846, University of Rochester. Hereafter cited as Weed Mss., UR.
- ¹⁶ *Facts and Reflections on the Course of Persons Representing What Has Been Called Young Ireland in Their Own Country and on Their Conduct since Their Arrival in the United States*. Undated notes, Hughes Papers, AANY. Hereafter cited as Hughes Mss., AANY.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁸ Hughes remains rather ambiguous in his notes. Thomas Davis, a young barrister who never actually entered the legal profession, came from Mallow, County Cork. He was joined by Charles Gavan Duffy, an Ulster Catholic journalist, and County Monaghan born John Blake Dillon, in founding *The Nation*. These men were all members of O'Connell's Repeal Association, but broke with it in early 1847 for its lack of militancy. Others becoming very prominent in Ireland, faced penal servitude in Australia and made their way to New York City, were Thomas D'Arcy McGee, John Mitchel and William Smith O'Brien. These individuals and their careers are treated in detail in Kevin B. Nowlan, *The Politics of Repeal* (London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul, 1965).
- ¹⁹ *Facts and Reflections*, *op. cit.*
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*
- ²¹ *Ibid.*
- ²² *Ibid.*, the account of Hughes' opinion of Young Ireland and their split with O'Connell has been somewhat amplified to deal with the more universal issue of violence versus non violence. For examples of the same, see Owen Dudley Edwards, "The American Image of Ireland," *Perspectives in American History*, IV, (1970), pp. 199-285; Gilbert Osofsky, "Abolitionists, Irish Immigrants, and the Dilemmas of Romantic Nationalism," *American Historical Review*, LXXX (October 1975), pp. 889-913.
- ²³ *Pastoral Letter of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Bishop of Basileopolis, Coadjutor to the Bishop and Administrator of the Diocese of New York in Regard to the Administration of the Sacraments, Secret Societies, and the "Trustee System" in Reference to Church Property*, September 8, 1842. Unpublished section on Young Ireland, Hughes Mss., AANY.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.* The Bishop did not specifically mention the name of this document but stated it was signed by officers obviously comprising some sort of a secret organization: P.F. Sloane, President, P. Sharkey, 1st Vice President, P. Murray, 2nd Vice President, Owen Lappen, Treasurer, T.H. Smith, Secretary. In addition, Hughes was further annoyed that this document had received a lengthy favorable editorial from Patrick Lynch, Editor of New York's *Irish-American*.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*
- ²⁷ The lecture appears in full in Kehoe, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, Part V, pp. 32-46.
- ²⁸ Hughes' earliest biographer, Hassard, describes the scene of the Bishop pacing back and forth in his office trying to decide whether or not he should attend the meeting. Bayley entreated him several times to send a letter of apology, and Hughes seemed to be on the verge of agreement, when it was announced that Greeley had arrived to escort him to Vauxhall Garden, p. 305.
- ²⁹ Kehoe, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 792. See also Hassard, *op. cit.*, pp. 305-307.
- ³⁰ *Freeman's Journal*, September 9, 1848. See also Kehoe, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 793-795. For a further insight into Hughes' feeling on the plight of Ireland at this period, see his reply to an address from the Catholics of Halifax, Nova Scotia, *Ibid.*, pp. 785-787.
- ³¹ Hughes to Robert Emmet, November 1848, in Hassard, *op. cit.*, pp. 306-309. Hughes directed Emmet to give his \$500 check to the Sisters of Mercy, "for the purchase of a shield to protect the purity and innocence of the poor, virtuous, destitute daughters of Ireland..."
- ³² Hughes' letters and McGee's replies are found in *Freeman's Journal*, January 13, 20, 27, February 3, 10, 1849. A thorough account of Hughes' activities on the Irish question at this period is also found in Browne Mss., AANY.
- ³³ Pledge of Thomas D'Arcy McGee-1849. AANY-Guilday Collection. Hereafter cited as AANY-GC.
- ³⁴ *Circular Letter of the Most Rev. John Hughes to the Clergy and Laity of the Archdiocese of New York in Reference to Thomas D'Arcy McGee and "The American Celt"*. 1856.
- ³⁵ Hughes to Thomas Francis Meagher, February 15, 1853. AANY-GC. The address had been given on January 10, 1853.
- ³⁶ Meagher to Hughes, February 19, 1853. AANY-GC.
- ³⁷ Hughes to Editor of *New York Daily Times*, August 12, 1854. AANY-GC.
- ³⁸ *The Citizen*, August 19, 1854.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, September 9, 1854.
- ⁴⁰ In 1845, the Bishop of Charleston Ignatius Reynolds had attempted to interest Hughes in a project of land and railroad development in Georgia. General A.H. Brisbane conceived the idea, thinking it an excellent way of making an Irish Catholic settlement, and Bishop Reynolds promoted it as a worthwhile idea. An agent was sent to see Hughes and the Bishop was apparently considering a trip to Charleston to look into matters more closely, but for some reason withdrew completely before disaster hit the venture. Browne Mss., AANY. Chapter IX, "First Among Equals," p. 8.
- ⁴¹ From about 1818, a Mr. James Leroy had numerous Irish settled in New York, while a more distinctly Irish colony was located at Silver Lake in Northeastern Pennsylvania.
- ⁴² Henry J. Browne. "Archbishop Hughes and Western Colonization," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXVI (October 1950), pp. 271-272.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 258.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 275. For the complete text of Hughes' remarks at this meeting, see Kehoe, *op. cit.*, pp. 751-756; *New York Times*, March 27, 1857. Five years later, speaking to an audience in Cork, Hughes painted a most optimistic picture of the results of an Irishman who determined to make it on his own in the West. Kehoe, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 772.
- ⁴⁵ McManus was another participant in the 1848 Young Ireland movement who had been deported to Australia, and later made his way to San Francisco, where he died in 1861. His body was brought to New York City, where it was subsequently placed on a steamer for Ireland, and burial in Dublin's Glasnevin Cemetery. Several of McManus' friends had asked Hughes if he would offer the funeral Mass at Saint Patrick's Cathedral, a request with which he complied after learning from the Archbishop of San Francisco that McManus had indeed been a practicing Catholic and had died in the good graces of the Church. Kehoe, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 527; 530; William D'Arcy, *The Fenian Movement in the United States, 1885-1886*. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1947), pp. 1-39.
- ⁴⁶ *Testimonial of Irish Nationalists to John Hughes for his Conducting Services over Terence B. McManus-July 24, 1862*. AANY-GC.
- ⁴⁷ Kehoe, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 527-528.
- ⁴⁸ For a good example of the same, see Hughes to John Francis Maguire, November 24, 1862, in Hassard, *op. cit.*, p. 483.
- ⁴⁹ Hughes to Editor of Dublin *Freeman's Journal*, February 14, 1863. AANY-GC.
- ⁵⁰ Kehoe, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 530.
- ⁵¹ Hughes to Archbishop Paul Cullen, December 5, 1862, in Hassard, *op. cit.*, pp. 483-484. Cullen was Archbishop of Dublin.
- ⁵² Hughes to Bishop McNally, March 26, 1863, in Hassard, *op. cit.*, pp. 484, 485. McNally was Bishop of Clogher in County Tyrone, the Diocese in which Hughes had been born and raised.
- ⁵³ Hughes to Robert Murray, Esq., February 3, 1851. AANY-GC.
- ⁵⁴ Kehoe, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 761.