At the height of the Know Nothing agitation in the eighteen-fifties, personal and political circumstances combined to project a Philadelphian and recent convert to Catholicism, Joseph Ripley Chandler, into a position of national prominence as a champion of his Church and defender of his fellow Catholics. Chandler was already well-known for his achievements in journalism, literature, and politics. A native of Massachusetts, he had come to Philadelphia in 1815 to work as a schoolmaster. When in 1822 he became a salaried editorial writer on the moribund Gazette of the United States, an association began that would bring the Gazette national influence as a Whig journal and Chandler, its eventual proprietor, distinction as an editor and publisher. E.P. Oberholtzer, Philadelphia’s literary historian, remarks of Chandler that “no man who ever edited a paper in Philadelphia brought greater honor to his journalist’s vocation.” For reasons of health Chandler sold the Gazette in 1847, but he maintained his connection with Graham’s American Monthly Magazine, serving as editor in 1848–1849. He also continued to contribute to it and to other magazines the polished pieces that had already brought him some measure of literary reputation. For many years a distinguished Freemason, Chandler’s speeches and writings on Masonic topics were highly esteemed and widely circulated in the United States and Western Europe. Finally, Chandler’s role as a long-time member of Philadelphia City Council and promoter of civic betterment had brought him the respect of his fellow citizens.

It is not difficult to understand why the Whig Committee of the Second Congressional District found him an attractive candidate for the United States Congress. First elected in 1848, he was re-elected in 1850 and again in 1852. In 1854, however, the Whig Committee declined to
renominate him. Chandler, unwilling to acquiesce in the Committee's decision, ran as an independent Whig and was soundly defeated. He and his supporters were convinced that Know Nothing influence had forced the Committee's decision, and this conviction was widely shared by Philadelphia's politicians and editors.

What had made Chandler unacceptable to the Whigs? The simple fact, his supporters believed, that, some time after his re-election in 1852, he had become a Roman Catholic. Chandler was apparently a Baptist when he married his second wife, Maud H. Jones, a Catholic, in July 1833. "For many years," Chandler recalled in 1875, "I went to the Catholic Church and carefully examined its doctrine and its claims to being the only true Church. At last when my doubting mind was satisfied, and the light of faith was vouchsafed to me, I stepped into it and followed the pathway it pointed out." It was not a pathway to political popularity, but Chandler, who had stood firm against the full fury of antimasonry in 1835, was not a man to sacrifice deeply held values for momentary advantage.

In the "lame duck" session of Congress, following close upon the Know Nothing successes in the border states and the Middle Atlantic and New England regions in the elections of 1854, Know Nothingism and nativism became subjects of heated debate. Notice of intention to file bills limiting immigration and restricting the freedoms of immigrants sparked discussion in the House. In an address on December 18, William S. Barry of Mississippi challenged the economic arguments of the Know Nothings and taxed them with an intention to introduce religious persecution into the United States. "Confederates who disfranchise one class of citizens soon turn upon each other," Barry argued; "the strong argument of general right is destroyed by their united action, and the proscriptionist of yesterday is the proscribed of tomorrow." He warned that such attempts at "proscription will do more to spread Catholicism here, than all the treasures of Rome, or all the Jesuitism of the Cardinals."

Nathaniel Banks of Massachusetts defended the Know Nothings, contending that their concern with Catholicism was not at the level of individual belief. He made specific reference to Joseph R. Chandler, whom he described as "an amiable, learned, and eloquent man." Banks suggested that he might be willing to vote for Chandler, "Catholic as he is, in preference perhaps, to others nearer my political faith than he is." Professing indifference to Chandler's views of the sacraments or the doctrines of original sin and justification, Banks observed that "each man is accountable for his own faith, as I for mine." Catholics were
politically suspect, however, Banks contended, because of the Pope's claim to temporal power "that can not only control governments, but, in fitting exigencies, may absolve his disciples from their allegiance. . . . Amid repeated instances of attempted exercise of temporal power in the last thousand years," Banks continued, "it has never once been disavowed or disclaimed by any pontiff, or general council, acquiesced in by the Pope." After challenging Barry to prove him wrong, Banks reiterated that "the Pontiff of Rome has never, in any authoritative form, disavowed the right to control the members of the Roman Catholic Church in secular matters." Banks said he was not reassured by disclaimers of Catholic friends, since "they have not the right to private opinion, much less the right to determine the faith of their Church."

L.M. Keitt of South Carolina offered some arguments in rebuttal on January 3, 1855, but the principal reply to Banks came in Chandler's set speech, "The Temporal Power of the Pope," delivered on January 11. The Philadelphian reminded the House that Banks had "made special and inculpating allusion to the creed of the Roman Catholic Church; involving a charge of latent treason against its members, or at least imputing to them an article of religious faith that overrides all fealty to the Government of the country, and would render them unworthy of public trust—suspected citizens and dangerous officers." His colleagues were aware that he avoided "any attempt to obtrude" his religious opinions upon them, Chandler proceeded, but as a professing Catholic, the senior of the two Catholic members of the House, he felt obliged to respond to the "imputation of a want of fealty to the Government," as a consequence of the nature of his obligations to the Catholic Church.

Chandler focused on Bank's assertion that "he does not bring into discussion the general creed of Catholics, but only that portion which . . . makes the professor dependent upon the Bishop of Rome, not merely for what he shall hold of faith towards God, but what he shall maintain of fealty towards his own political Government." Chandler denied "to the Bishop of Rome the right resulting from his divine office, to interfere in the relations between subjects and their sovereigns." He continued:

And while I make this denial, I acknowledge all my obligations to the church of which I am an humble member, and I recognize all the rights of the venerable head of that church to the spiritual deference of its children, and I desire that no part of what I may say, or what I may concede, . . . may be considered as yielding a single dogma of the Catholic Church, or manifesting on my part, a desire to explain away, to suit the spirit of the times, or the
prejudices of my hearers, any doctrine of the Catholic Church. I believe all that the Church believes and teaches as religious dogmas but I am not bound by the imputations of its opponents.

Chandler emphatically denied that the power of the Pope "impinges, in the least degree, upon the political allegiance which any Roman Catholic of this country may owe to the Government and constitution of the United States." Personalizing his denial, Chandler was interrupted by applause when he declaimed:

... If the Bishop of Rome should become possessed of armies and a fleet, and . . . invade the territory of the United States or assail the rights of our country, he would find no more earnest antagonists than the Roman Catholics. And for myself, if not here in this Hall to vote supplies for a defending army, or if too old to take part in the active defense, I should, if alive, be at least in my chamber, or at the foot of the altar, imploring God for the safety of my country and the defeat of the invaders.

Chandler's rhetorical plan was well conceived. He moved from his own opinion as a Roman Catholic, "since it may be asserted that, as a republican and layman," he could not understand all the doctrinal nuances of Papal relations, to those of the Bishops and Archbishops of the United States, who "fully held, and openly asserted and approved" the position which he had advanced. Particular emphasis was given to the writings of Bishop England of Charleston, but he also referred to the views of Archbishops Kenrick and Hughes, Bishop Spalding, the Baltimore Council of 1843, and, for good measure, Archbishop Troy of Dublin.

"But I shall, of course, be asked," Chandler went on, "whence the boldness of the assertion against Catholics, and whence the readiness to believe the charges, if they are altogether unfounded?" The fact that the Popes had deposed monarchs, released subjects from their allegiance, and interfered with the temporalities of sovereigns, Chandler acknowledged, might justify "the apprehensions of the timid" and "give some appearance of probability to the assertion of the bold, reckless, and unprincipled party politicians...." Nevertheless, Chandler insisted, in light of the charges by Banks, the key question was "not whether the right had been claimed, but on what grounds it had been asserted." He distinguished between "a divine right," inherent in the spiritual office of the Bishop of Rome, which could "never lapse," and "a right conferred for special occasions, by those interested in its exercise...." Working from this distinction, Chandler argued that the political power of the
Popes outside their own dominions fell into the second category, and, hence, “never was an article of Roman Catholic faith.” Temporal power conferred by temporal consent was, Chandler commented, confused by some “weak persons of that time” with “the spiritual power conferred by Christ, and sustained by the Scriptures.” There were, he said, “individuals of less discretion than zeal,” who from a mistaken view of Christian duty, “thought it a merit on themselves to impute to religion a direct secular power which it was never intended by God, nor understood by good, prudent men, to exercise.” The churches have come to consider this, Chandler observed, “as rendering unto God the things which are Caesar’s.”

He then reviewed in detail the classic case of Papal political intervention, Pope Gregory VII’s deposition of Emperor Henry IV, and concluded that the Pope’s action was based “not merely on the divine power of binding and loosing” but on the constitution of the Empire as well. The medieval Church, Chandler contended, “did not claim for the Popes the authority to exercise temporal power over other sovereigns, by Divine right . . .” Nor, he reiterated, does the Church today make such a claim: “In the pursuit of information with regard to the Catholic Church,” Chandler told his colleagues, “it has been my chance to converse with every rank and degree of her hierarchy—Pope, Cardinal, Nuncio, Archbishop, Bishop, and Priest, and I never heard one of them claim any such power, and never heard one of them speak upon the subject who did not disavow any belief of its existence.”

As further evidence of the general opinion of the Church, Chandler advanced the responses of the theological faculties of the principal Catholic universities of Belgium, France, and Spain to three propositions submitted at the request of William Pitt by the Catholics of London in 1789. The propositions were carefully drawn to cover the whole question of the temporal authority of the Pope, the dissolving of allegiance, and the obligations of Catholics in transactions with those who did not share their religious beliefs. As Chandler summed it up, the theological faculties “all concur in declaring, that no man, nor any body of men, of the Church of Rome, however assembled, has power to interfere with the affairs of other kingdoms.”

The responses of the theological faculties satisfied the British Parliament, Chandler said, but they do not satisfy Mr. Banks, who insists that the Pope has never “in any authoritative form” disavowed a right to control the members of the Roman Catholic Church in secular affairs. To meet Bank’s objection, Chandler introduced a curial document, dated June, 1791, prepared at the Pope’s direction and under his
THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE

authority. This document, a response to a request from the Archbishop of Ireland for a clear statement of Catholic teaching on the Pope's temporal authority over the subjects of other kingdoms, specifically disavowed the principal charges made by the critics of the Church.24

With a warning on the great political price of religious proscription and a prediction that danger to the country would come not from the prevalence of any form of Christianity but from atheism and infidelity, Chandler rested his case.25

While Chandler was not a theologian, more than thirty years as a journalist and politician had sharpened his rhetorical skills. The New York Times described his address as "very eloquent and exceedingly ingenious."26 His arguments were directed to the issues raised by Rep. Banks, the stock-in-trade of a political anti-Catholicism, and avoided theological speculations.

What Chandler said was important, but perhaps even more important was who said it and where. Chandler was a Whig of considerable reputation, not a Democrat who profited from the immigrant vote. He was a Catholic of Yankee, not Celtic origins; a man whose views had been taken seriously for decades. His arguments could not be rejected out of hand. In a day when newspapers were tied tightly to party and faction, an address in the House of Representatives need not depend for circulation on the caprice of editors. Chandler's address, as printed in the Congressional Globe, went into every Congressional district in the country. It could be, and was, excerpted and sent to voters in a district under Congressional frank.

It was in the partisan interest of Democrats to applaud Chandler's performance, and equally in the partisan interest of Know Nothings to condemn it. A dozen Know Nothings vied for the honor of answering him,27 and in the House the principal response came from W.R. Smith of Alabama.28 Smith's address was charged with the spirit of militant Protestantism: "The sooner our children are taught that the Jesuits and priests have been raised from their cradle to seduce us, the better for us. . . ." He referred to "lousy monks and lock-shorn nuns" and cited the "Jesuit's oath," which, Smith alleged included a specific denunciation of allegiance to Protestant monarchs or governments and a pledge to do everything possible to "extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrine."29

After a pejorative review of the history of the Jesuits, Smith warned his colleagues that "the Jesuit comes in all shapes, in all forms. They are spread all over the United States." Bound by oath of obedience to the Pope, "they swear no allegiance—except with mental reservations—to the Constitution of the United States. They are ready to teach the
Catholic laity, who apply for citizenship, that the oath to support the constitution of the United States is no oath at all, when it conflicts with their duty to the Pope or to his bishops. He then turned to what he termed "the most delicate and important subject that has ever engrossed the attention of the American republic" and warned his fellow citizens of "the dangerous tendency" of the Roman Catholic religion. "From its first days to the present," Smith declared, "it has on all occasions, without the slightest exception, been averse to liberty, and to free constitutions." Tracing the development of papal power, with numerous references to Joseph de Maistre's work on the Papacy, Smith challenged Chandler:

But the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania disclaims for himself, and for certain colleges and councils, that the Pope claims any purpose to despose or to interfere with monarchs, or to absolve their subjects. His personal disclaimer can amount to nothing except so far as the gentleman himself is concerned. The disclaiming of the colleges and councils amount to nothing except so far as the individuals are concerned who compose the colleges and councils. Besides being in the face of the historical acts of the Romish church for six or eight centuries, they are positively contradicted by the legal Catholic book of De Maistre.

On the basis of this and other evidence, Smith concluded that Banks was right in his contention that the Roman Pontiff had never "in any authoritative form" disclaimed the right of political intervention. Smith rejected Chandler's pledge to resist a papal military invasion as irrelevant. The Pope, he said, does not war with armies and navies. "His excommunication is the only sword he needs—his armies are the innumerable hosts of superstition. . . The very daggers of the air, which appall the firmest heart, unnerve the stoutest body, and paralyze the strongest intellect. Will the gentleman say that against an excommunication he would dare to raise his head, his hand, or his voice?" The Alabaman conjured up the spectre of an excommunicated Chandler, "his spirit . . . prostrated, his mind . . . unhinged, his soul . . . crushed; an American Congressman . . . denied entrance into the lowest Catholic hovel in the purlieus of Washington." Smith gave his imagination free reign, "Suppose the gentleman was the President of the United States—and his name, I believe, has been honorably mentioned in that connection—as a man he would still be liable to excommunication by an American Bishop, . . . and the Chief Magistracy of this Union would be groveling in the dust at the foot of the Roman Catholic power." Whether
or not the Pope claims the right to depose is immaterial, Smith asserted, “if under the terrors of excommunication, the mysterious and prostrating powers of the Church can be ... put to work.” Rallying his countrymen to resist the clear and present danger of Catholicism, Smith called upon “every Protestant [to] make himself a sentinel on the watch towers of liberty.”

Outside Congress, the Protestant clergy, whom Smith had described as “God-appointed sentinels,” sprang to the defense, with the voluble assistance of two emigré ex-priests, Alessandro Gavazzi and John Claudius Pitrot. Gavazzi, who had fled Italy after the failure of the Revolution of 1848 and was notorious for his role in the “Bedini riots” in the United States in 1853, ignored the nuances of Chandler’s address and saw him as holding “that Popes do not, nor ever did, interfere with the political affairs of other governments.” As proof to the contrary, Gavazzi reviewed in considerable detail the role of the Papacy in contemporary Italian politics, in which, understandably enough, he seemed to have an obsessive interest. Of the two emigrés, Pitrot, billed on his title page as “a Member of the University of France ... and Formerly a Catholic Priest,” appears more tightly linked to the Know Nothings. His publisher was Edward W. Hinks of Boston, who also issued a weekly newspaper titled *The Know Nothing and American Crusader*, and his literary credits included a novel, *Paul and Julia, or the Political Mysteries, Hypocrisy, and Cruelty of the Leaders of the Church of Rome*. In a seventy-two page pamphlet, Pitrot offered a paragraph-by-paragraph rebuttal of Chandler’s speech.

Pitrot conceded that the temporal power of the Pope “is not an article of faith in the Romish Church,” but, citing St. Alphonsus Ligouri as his authority, went on to develop the argument that the Pope “has this right indirectly, ... by using his supreme spiritual power.” He dismissed Chandler’s pledge to resist a Papal invasion as “high-sounding and empty words” and asked, “... Why does Mr. Chandler ... not disavow that he is bound, in conscience, to follow the instructions of the Pope, and to combine together with his fellow citizens of the same church, to obtain the modification ... or abolition of the political institutions of this country when they are unfavorable to the interests of his church?" Pitrot expressed regret that a man like Chandler had been “enticed by the leaders of the church.” “It reminds us,” Pitrot continued, “of many of our acquaintances—genuine souls they are—who are kept in the Popish bondage by the sophistry of theologians, and by the hypocrisy of several bishops we know well.” If Chandler ever studies Catholic theology, “becomes initiated” and does not yield to the bribery of the
leaders of the church, "because of his sincerity and honesty, he will certainly proclaim to the world, that he has been deceived by his religious rulers; and that Romanism is the deadliest foe of American institutions." The irony of Yankee Chandler's being lectured on American institutions by European immigrants, under the auspices of the Know Nothings, could have escaped only the most obtuse of his critics.

Another foreign-born critic benefited from the presumptive patriotism of the English-speaking Protestant. It was a matter of some small embarrassment to Native Americans in Philadelphia when a local minister, Dr. Joseph Berg, whose polemics were quoted with frequency and enthusiasm by the Nativist Sun, was identified as a native of the British West Indies. Nonetheless, Berg published a critique of Chandler's remarks, centering on the meaning of the term "tenet of the Catholic faith," which he considered so restrictive as to be irrelevant. While he would grant that Chandler's argument was sincerely offered, Berg insisted that it was fallacious and inconsistent with Catholic practice.

A more formidable rejoinder came from Dr. Joseph C. Grundy, pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Maysville, Ky. With Berg, Grundy would concede Chandler's sincerity, but his argument, the Kentuckian contended, "so perfectly flies in the face of the facts of history, as to betray an ignorance which it is difficult to impute to one of his high position and character, and a position, too, which is directly in the face of the known and acknowledged authorities of his Church." Chandler has been deceived by the bishops "who are the sworn servants of the Pope to do this very thing." The Maysville minister cited Aquinas, Baronius, and Bellarmine, among others, to counter Chandler's argument. Why, he asks, if there is such ample evidence that the Popes have claimed and exercised, as of divine right, a secular authority, and the ablest writers and theologians have defended it, can Chandler cite such unanimity among American bishops, Irish bishops, and Belgian and Spanish theological faculties? How can they "all unite in ignoring the doctrine and denying such a power to the Pope?" How can Chandler, who in seeking information on Catholicism talked to Church officials from the Pope down, say that he never encountered anything but disavowal of the existence of such a power? "But it can be explained; and the very explanation will show you that the Honorable Mr. Chandler has been deceived by his Bishops, or else he is himself a Jesuit." Grundy proceeded to explain the split between the Cisalpine and ultramontanist forces in the Church. "... Rome has two faces, and
is at full liberty to speak to suit the direction in which she looks." All of Chandler's authorities are Cisalpine. He either deceives or is deceived, Grundy charged as he urged Chandler to go to Rome and seek a disclaimer from the Pope. It is simply not true, he argued, that the "deposing power" was not "an article of faith" or "proposed as such by any Council or by any Popes themselves who exercised it," and cited eight Councils, from Lateran to Trent, in support of his position. Chandler was deceived by the Bishops and "made an instrument in the hands of these papal prelates to deceive and ruin the American people." 50

Similar arguments were advanced by a Methodist clergyman, Dr. John M'Clintock, who in addition to citing the usual European theological authorities invoked the testimony of an American, Orestes A. Brownson. 51 Since 1851, Brownson had been engaged in a campaign against "Gallicanism," which he saw as the root of the deplorable "political atheism" of his era, offering as an alternative explanation of the Church-State relationship a theory of the indirect temporal power of the Pope, temporal power which flowed from the Pope's exercise of his spiritual authority as head of the Church. 52 Brownson's vigorous advocacy of this view had already led to tense relations with several American bishops, particularly Bishop Michael O'Connor, and other Catholic publicists who rejected the redoubtable controversialist's ultramontane position. Chandler's address had followed the line of Bishop O'Connor and his allies. Brownson, therefore, seized the opportunity to critique Chandler's (and O'Connor's) views while responding to M'Clintock in the October, 1855, issue of Brownson's Quarterly Review. Chandler, he contended, had evaded the real issue, the indirect power of the Pope. He would have been better pleased, Brownson wrote, if Chandler had answered Banks by demonstrating that even on ultramontane principles Catholicity is compatible with the loyalty of subject and the autonomy and independence of the state in its own order. With respect to M'Clintock, Brownson acknowledged that the Methodist theologian had fairly stated his position, but he insisted that the latter had failed to perceive that the assertion of the supremacy of the spiritual order was part and parcel of American Protestantism and the American political tradition. 53

Even before Brownson's attack on Chandler's position, several of the Bishops had expressed uneasiness at the implicit approval given Brownson's controversial views by the presence of their names on the cover of his journal, and an exchange of letters between Brownson and Archbishop Kenrick had led to an understanding that the Bishops'
names would be withdrawn at the beginning of the next volume, in
1856. "It seems," Brownson wrote to a friend, "it is necessary for the
peace of the Church that I should make way for the Chandlers to defend
Catholicity on Gallican principles."

The controversy continued to rage, however, and in September, 1855,
Bishop O'Connor requested that his name be withdrawn, and
Brownson reluctantly agreed to omit the entire episcopal endorsement
from his next number. The critique of Chandler, therefore, appeared
in an issue which bore no hint of episcopal approbation.

By October, 1855, when the Brownson attack was published,
Chandler had returned to Philadelphia as a private citizen. Although
Chandler's formal (and brief) association with The Catholic Herald
would not begin until later, it is reasonable to assume that Herald's
response to the Brownson article reflects his views. "Mr. Chandler we
have reason to know has not felt called upon to respond to any of the
numerous replies to his speech, probably because he does not profess to
be a theologian—and knows that the Bishops of the Catholic Church in
this country understand the doctrines of the Church, and are able . . . ,
eminently able, to assert and defend these doctrines." His speech, the
Herald continued, was "a simple reply to the challenge contained in the
speech of the Hon. Mr. Banks...." The anti-Catholics and Know
Nothings thought the speech so complete that they immediately
launched a campaign "to obviate the effects on the public mind which
such a plain unvarnished presentation of authorities . . . was likely to
produce." The result is an "immense pile" of sermons, speeches, letters,
and tracts, which, the Herald insisted, avoided dealing with the
arguments actually offered by Chandler.

The Herald was extremely critical of Brownson for supplying a
convenient authority in support of the idea that the Pope possessed
temporal authority by divine right, which could be used "to sustain the
hostility of those who now seek to disfranchise the Roman Catholics of
this country." "We some weeks since," the Herald continued,
took occasion to state distinctly that it was proof of the liberty of
Catholics that they could thus openly discuss an open question
which is not a doctrine, but we nevertheless think that since it is not
a doctrine, it is rather an unfortunate effort on the part of Mr.
Brownson to come forward at a time of peculiar difficulty and
strengthen the hands of the enemies of our Church and the
destroyer of our Churches by trying to prove true, that which being
admitted is a sanction to the hostility of our antagonists.

The Herald found "laughable" Brownson's charge that Chandler had
reopened an internal controversy among Catholics. It noted Brownson’s long-term and consistent advocacy of what the Herald termed his “anti-Catholic opinion” in the face of telling criticisms from Bishops, priests, and laymen. Turning to Brownson’s observation that Chandler would have done better to have repelled Banks’ attack “in the highest tone of ultramontanism,” the Herald asserted that it would have been “simply ridiculous” for Chandler to base his argument on doctrines which he and most of the Bishops of the United States did not accept.

The great and prevailing error of Mr. Brownson’s writings on the subject to which we now refer, is his determination on all occasions to place himself in front of everything, even the Church. No doctrine of the Catholic Church seems worthy [of] an advocacy in his Review without being marked with his approval and defense, as a sort of necessity. As the inspector brands the barrel that contains the flour for market.

It is also “a common error” of the Review, the Herald remarked, to make “a rash, startling assertion and then at some distance of pages, if not of time, so qualify or mystify it as to have it doubtful whether he meant all that he said or said all that he meant.”

The Herald’s strong defense of Chandler and chastisement of Brownson reflected the practical concerns of many Bishops and lay leaders. At a time of political and physical danger, they were little inclined to opt for a position on Church-State relations that would have the effect of heightening tensions when a theology of Papal power compatible with American republican values was available and doctrinally acceptable. Moreover, American Catholics of Irish origin could not be indifferent to the implications of Brownson’s ultramontanism for the still precarious religious freedom of Ireland.

Several months later, Chandler would offer his final comments in the editorial columns of the Herald. A local editor had suggested that the Know Nothings had no quarrel with the Gallican Catholics of the United States. “Now we were anxious to known,” Chandler reported, “what class of Roman Catholics were included in the category of Gallicans, and we found that it was the Catholic Church in Louisiana.” Louisiana Catholics had been cleared of the charge of owing “allegiance to a foreign sovereign” on the strength of a pastoral letter by the Archbishop of New Orleans denying to the Pope any temporal power outside the Papal States. Chandler noted that the New Orleans letter did not differ substantially from statements issued by other Bishops and Archbishops. The Bishops fully sustain “the assertions of the writers upon the subject . . . and though in a single instance the opinions of a
layman were considered as opposite”—an obvious reference to Brownson—"yet even those opinions have we suppose been changed."

"There is in this country," Chandler continued, "no such thing as a Gallican Church." Prelates, priests, and informed laity are in agreement that the Pope has no temporal power outside the Papal States, "except such as he acquires by concordats and treaties," and in the present state of religious feeling, such pacts "must . . . work mischief to religion, if not to politics."

The theological controversy would continue through the First and Second Vatican Councils, but Chandler's "Temporal Power of the Pope" became part of the lore of American Catholicism, and early in the twentieth century when another outbreak of political Catholicism threatened, the 1854 speech was republished and became a text for a new generation of Catholic school-children.
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