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This study investigates Irishmen who served as soldiers in the Italian *Risorgimento* and the American Civil War, and their role in Irish nation-building in the mid-nineteenth century. In the first section, the main focus is on specific transnational links uncovered through the analysis of letters penned by soldiers who served both in Italy and the USA in the 1860s. My work addresses the wider historical significance and context of the Irish soldiers’ lives, and assesses the key topics revealed and elaborated in the soldiers’ correspondence. These topics include issues such as contemporary Irish views on Italian nationalist Giuseppe Garibaldi, the service of Irish soldiers in foreign armies, Irish Catholic nationalism, the use of transnational Catholicism for career advancement, and the transatlantic nature of the Fenian movement that aimed to secure national independence for Ireland. This analysis ultimately reveals that these men had a number of different identities coexisting within their military lives.

The second and larger part of my study compares the attitudes of Irish soldiers to the most influential themes that affected their motivations for enlisting in Italy and America and, by extension, their identity. In contrast to the men above, these soldiers served either in the Italian *Risorgimento* or in the American Civil War, but not in both. This approach facilitates a comparative assessment of the different attitudes of Irish soldiers in these nineteenth-century conflicts. Three major core themes motivated the soldiers: Irish Catholic nationalism; an anti-British sentiment; and attitudes to other ethnicities and nationalities. The strength of the bond between Irish national identity and Catholicism, which was the reason why many Irishmen volunteered to fight in 1860, underwent a major test through the experience of battling both with and against fellow Christians in Italy. On the other hand, for many Union Irish soldiers, religious devotion was strengthened by the institutional support provided by the expanding Catholic Church in America, together with a potent anti-British feeling which became exasperated as a result of Britain’s sympathy for Italian unification and later for the Confederate States. Both in Italy and the USA, Irish interaction with other ethnicities often resulted in tension. Union Irish soldiers in America, however, felt the additional need to prove their loyalty to their new country, and this led, in many cases, to prejudice and unwillingness to be associated with other ethnic groups, particularly African Americans.
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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation focuses on Irish soldiers in Italy in 1860 and in the American Civil War in 1861-1865.¹ These men helped to create a forming image of an Irish nation across state boundaries by emphasising their three central motivations - Catholic religion, Irish ethnicity and Anglophobia - in the face of the opposing aims and sentiments of those they came in contact with. My argument is that they played an important part in a much wider process of Irish nation-building at mid-nineteenth century through their enhancement of Irish Catholic nationalism, their representation of Irish nationhood abroad, and their desire for a future Irish republic modelled on that in the United States. Thus, my study is about Irish nationalism and nation-building at mid-nineteenth century, viewed through the experiences of a specific group of Irish soldiers who served in foreign armies in Italy and in America.

In mid-1860, in the Italian peninsula, the Papal States ruled by Pope Pius IX were bordered to the north by the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia. Pius IX feared that the Papal Territory, and possibly Rome itself, would be next to be incorporated into the expanding Piedmontese kingdom in the process leading to Italian national unification. Therefore, he requested assistance from Catholic nations in Europe to prevent this. In Ireland, the Catholic Church launched a campaign to raise awareness and to assist Pius IX in his fight against the Piedmontese. In response to this, approximately 1,300 Irishmen arrived in the Papal States in early summer 1860, in the hope of serving their spiritual leader as members of a unit known as the Papal Battalion of St Patrick. On 11 September, the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia invaded the Papal States, and took control of the territory, with the exception of Rome, after less than a month. Most of the men of the Papal Battalion returned to

Ireland, but some chose to continue their military careers elsewhere, most notably in the United States. There they joined other Irishmen enlisted to fight with the Union Army in the American Civil War 1861-1865. The experiences of this Irish military diaspora are revealing from both a transnational and comparative perspective.

This work has two central research aims, within one overall connecting theme: nineteenth-century Irish nationalism and nation-building. My first research aim focuses on the ‘identification of little-known or neglected links and connections between different parts of the world at the time of the American Civil War and the Italian Risorgimento’, in this case Ireland, Italy, and America.\(^2\) Specific transnational correlations emerge from the analysis of letters penned by those Irish soldiers who served both in Italy and America in the 1860s. These men were Myles Walter Keogh (Co. Carlow), Patrick Felan Clooney and Daniel Joseph Keily (Co. Waterford), John Joseph Coppinger and Joseph O’Keeffe (Co. Cork), John Hassett Gleeson, Michael Louis Luther and Michael Smith (Co. Tipperary), and John Dillon Mulhall (Co. Roscommon). Tracing their military careers highlights the importance of largely under-researched military, religious and ethnic interactions between Ireland, Italy and America in the 1860s. The importance of the experiences of these men lies in the fact that they were part of a unique cohort which fought both in the Italian Risorgimento and in the American Civil War. Hence, their lives epitomise the significance of the numerous transnational and transatlantic links between different countries at mid-nineteenth century.\(^3\)

In analysing the writings of this group of Irish soldiers, and in assessing the key topics revealed and elaborated on in their correspondence, my work aims to

---


locate their lives within a wider historical significance and context. Subjects that emerge from their writings include contemporary Irish views on Italian nationalist Giuseppe Garibaldi, the service of Irish soldiers in foreign armies, Irish Catholic nationalism, the use of transnational Catholicism for career advancement, and the transatlantic nature of the Fenian movement which aimed at securing national independence for Ireland. My analysis ultimately reveals that these Irish soldiers had many different identities coexisting within their military lives, some more so than others. They were simultaneously professional military men, devout Catholics in the service of the Pope, careerists who were not averse to using their religious contacts for self-advancement, brave soldiers willing to serve and, if necessary, die, for the unity and preservation of the United States, and patriotic Irishmen who hoped to assist their homeland in altering its political situation.

My second research aim, which informs the second part of my study, is the correlation of the attitudes of Irish soldiers with the most influential themes that affected their motivations for enlisting in foreign armies in either Italy or America, especially in relation to their growing sense of Irish Catholic nationalism. Thus, in contrast to the Irishmen at the heart of the first half of my study, the Irish soldiers in the second half of my study served either in Italy or in America, but not in both. This different focus allows me to implement a comparative assessment of the different attitudes of Irish soldiers in the American Civil War and in the Italian Risorgimento. In analysing the letters and other writings of these specific Irish soldiers, I argue that there were three major core themes that motivated them: Irish Catholic nationalism; an anti-British sentiment; and negative attitudes to other ethnicities and nationalities. The strength of the bond between Irish national identity and Catholicism, which was the reason why many Irishmen volunteered in the Papal Army in 1860, underwent a major test through the experience of fighting both with and against fellow Christians in Italy. Conversely, for many Irish Catholic soldiers in the Union army, their

---


5 On Irish Catholic nationalism and the Papal Army, see especially Ciarán O’Carroll, ‘The Papal Brigade of Saint Patrick’, in Dáire Keogh & Albert McDonnell (eds.), The Irish College, Rome and its World, (Dublin, 2008), pp. 167-187; Ciarán O’Carroll, ‘The Irish Papal Brigade: Origins, Objectives and Fortunes’, in Barr, Finelli & O’Connor (eds.), Nation/Nazione, pp. 73-95. I should point out that Catholic nationalism was not the only version of Irish nationalism in existence at mid-
religious devotion was strengthened by the institutional support provided by the expanding American Catholic Church. Together with this, an already potent anti-British feeling was exasperated by Britain’s perceived sympathy for Italian unification and later for the Confederate States of America. Equally important in terms of shaping the Irish soldiers’ identity was the fact that, both in Italy and in America, Irish interactions with other ethnicities often resulted in tension. Irish soldiers in America, however, felt the additional need to prove their loyalty to a new country, and this led, in many cases, to prejudice towards, and an unwillingness to be associated with, other ethnic groups, particularly African Americans.

Throughout this section of my work, I engage in sustained comparison between the above three major motivating themes in order to establish how they played different roles in the experiences of Irish soldiers in Italy and in America. Ultimately, I argue that Irish Catholic nationalism was the most influential motivating factor for Irish soldiers in Italy, whilst in America anti-British sentiment...
and ethnic interaction had a bigger impact on nineteenth-century Irish expatriate soldiers. As was the case with those Irish soldiers who became veterans of both the Italian Risorgimento and the American Civil War, the men who served either in Italy or in America were also representatives of the wider process of Irish nation-building at mid-nineteenth century, a process that owed a great deal to the support for Irish Catholic nationalism outside Ireland. The version of Irish Catholic nationalism that played such an important role in the lives of all the Irish soldiers in this study was one that epitomised pride in Irish ethnicity closely linked to Catholic religion. In other words, whether at home or abroad, the Irish soldiers believed that to be a Catholic and to be an Irishman were tightly linked factors.

At present, there is no scholarly monograph that connects the nineteenth-century histories of Ireland, Italy, and America through a transnational research. With my work, I intend to begin scholarly studies on this tripartite connection, using as a case in point the experiences of Irish soldiers who fought in the Papal States in 1860 and in America in 1861-1865. Previous scholarship has addressed various elements of my research, albeit to differing extents. Firstly, several historians of Italian unification have highlighted the advantage of investigating nineteenth-century Italian nation-building through a focus on the ordinary men and women involved, a major feature of the new historiography of the Risorgimento. In this connection, Lucy Riall has stated that the work of scholars such as Alberto Mario Banti and

---

9 In the case of Ireland, as in the case of several other nationalities, the ‘process of building the nineteenth-century nation, and especially imagining it as a political community, often took place outside its geographical borders’, in the words of Maura O’Connor. See Maura O’Connor, ‘Cross-National Travelers: Rethinking Comparisons and Representations’, in Deborah Cohen & Maura O’Connor (eds.), Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-national Perspective, (London, 2004), p. 136. See also Raponi, Religion and Politics in the Risorgimento, p. 119

others has aimed ‘to establish the political and personal projects of the men and women who took part in the Risorgimento’. ¹¹ She has explained that ‘historians are more interested in how people lived the Risorgimento, how they took part in, felt about and described these activities, and how they remembered what they had done’. ¹² Similarly, in my study I tell the story of ordinary young Irishmen who participated in the Risorgimento, though in opposition to its aims, risking their lives in defence of the Papal States against Italian unification. I then extend this approach to the study of ordinary Irishmen in the Union army, ¹³ by establishing both the motivations that drove them and the transnational themes epitomised by the lives of those who saw military service in both Europe and North America, and who were very conscious of their Irish Catholic identity and of its perception abroad.

My work, therefore, takes the mobility of Irish soldiers as a framework in order to reveal hidden transnational connections between the Italian Risorgimento and the American Civil War through the analysis of the soldiers’ lives. In other words, my study uses ‘the potential of individual life stories to radically explicate the worlds in which they were lived’, assessing the wider significance of the lives of ordinary and previously unknown individuals through a particular attention to the transnational contexts within which they operated. ¹⁴ In doing so, I aim to assess how aware these Irish soldiers were of their roles in the wider historical events of which they were part. I believe there is little doubt that, even though coming from isolated parts of rural Ireland, they were acutely aware of, and intent on being involved in, two of the most important global events at mid-nineteenth century: the unification of Italy and the American Civil War. In this regard, the transnational approach allows me to shed light on the ways in which local - in this case Irish - history can be

¹¹ Riall, Risorgimento, pp. 128-129.
¹² Riall, Risorgimento, p. 50
¹³ On the experiences of ordinary soldiers during the American Civil War, see especially Drew Gilpin Faust, This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War, (New York, 2008); Gerald F. Linderman, Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War, (New York, 1987); James McPherson, What They Fought For, 1861-1865, (Baton Rouge, 1994); James M. McPherson, For Cause and Comrades: Why Men Fought in the Civil War, (New York, 1997); Reid Mitchell, Civil War Soldiers, (New York, 1997)
understood in relation to major events in the wider nineteenth-century world, and tie together the local to the global in a combined transnational historical narrative.\textsuperscript{15}

Though there is a relatively large body of literature on the motivations and identity of Union Irish soldiers, little is known on the thoughts and beliefs of the Irish soldiers of the Papal Battalion, despite the existence of a number of works on the soldiers themselves.\textsuperscript{16} Many of them were only in their late teens or early twenties when they arrived in Italy, and for the majority it was the first time not only outside of Ireland, but also outside the immediate area in which they had been born.

Between 1929, when G.F.H. Berkeley published the most comprehensive account of Irish Papal soldiers - \textit{The Irish Battalion in the Papal Army of 1860} - and 2005, the only significant work on Ireland’s contribution to Italian unification was Robert Dudley Edwards’ edited collection \textit{Ireland and the Italian Risorgimento} (1960).\textsuperscript{17} Since 2005, though, there has been a growing, though still limited, amount of new scholarship. Charles A. Coulombe’s \textit{The Pope’s Legion} (2008), Mary Jane Cryan’s \textit{The Irish and English in Italy’s Risorgimento} (2011), and journal articles by Anne O’Connor, Jennifer O’Brien, and Robert Doyle, have all advanced our knowledge on this topic.\textsuperscript{18} More recent works such as Ian Kenneally’s \textit{Courage and Conflict} (2010) and book chapters by Ciarán O’Carroll have also focused on the Papal Battalion.\textsuperscript{19} Despite some of these works touching on the transnational links epitomised by the Irish soldiers’ experiences in Italy, or on the motivating themes that led to their enlistment in the Papal Battalion, my work is unique, as to date there is no in-depth analysis on those Irish soldiers who fought both in Italy and in America in the 1860s.

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{16} For a recent study of the letters of an individual Papal Battalion soldier, see Florry O’Driscoll, ‘Confounding the Garibaldian Liars: The Letters of Albert Delahoyde, Irish Soldier of the Papal Battalion of St Patrick and Papal Zouave in Italy, 1860-1870’, \textit{Studi Irlandesi}, No. 6 (2016), pp. 49-63


\textsuperscript{19} Ian Kenneally, \textit{Courage and Conflict: Forgotten Stories of the Irish at War}, (Cork, 2009); O’Carroll, ‘The Papal Brigade of Saint Patrick’, pp. 167-187; O’Carroll, ‘The Irish Papal Brigade’, pp. 73-95
\end{flushleft}
My study also builds on a relatively large body of scholarship on the Irish immigrant experience in the American Civil War, a scholarship which has greatly expanded our understanding of the historical importance and transnational dimension of this major nineteenth-century conflict. Specifically, a significant number of studies has examined the military contribution of various ethnic groups, including the Irish, to both the Union and the Confederacy. Within this group of studies, many scholars have pointed out the supposedly divided allegiances of some of the immigrant groups, asserting that often their loyalty for their new home was superseded by the one for their mother country. This appears to have been especially pronounced in the case of the Irish. Susannah Ural Bruce, in particular, has focused on the tendency of Irishmen in the Union army to explain their actions to their families in relation to both their Irish and American heritages. This dual loyalty increasingly influenced the Irish volunteers in the Union army by creating a balancing act of competing allegiances. My work supports Bruce’s findings, since I also uncovered a conflict within the Irish soldiers’ writings over whether their loyalty should be primarily to Ireland or to the Union. As the war progressed, though, their priorities, in most cases, shifted from their adopted home in North


23 Bruce, The Harp and the Eagle, pp. 1-6
America to their birthplace in Ireland, though at no point did they completely relinquish their responsibilities towards the United States.

In his recent analysis, however, James Zibro has claimed that there is much we still have to learn about the common Union Irish soldier. Zibro has criticised elements of previous scholarly works, including Bruce’s *The Harp and the Eagle*, asserting that they propagate ‘antiquated stereotypes’. Zibro has further accused current scholarship of being ‘sizeable in scope’, but ‘limited in insight’. Following Zibro’s suggestions to implement novel approaches, my work analyses the ordinary Union Irish soldier through a transnational angle, in the hope of learning more about his identity and motivations, and challenging accepted viewpoints on the wider Irish community in the USA. My work questions the views of the Irish, scholarly or otherwise, as young unskilled mercenaries, heroic fighters, drunken malcontents, cowardly deserters, or a combination of all of the above. Similarly to Zibro, I too refute the perception of the Union Irish soldier as ‘hapless, half-starved, and lacking any marketable skills’.24 In my case, though, through a transnational perspective, I do not focus solely on the Irish soldiers in the Union army in 1861-1865, but I make connections and draw comparisons with the Irish military experience in Italy in 1860. This transnational and comparative perspective reveals a great deal about Irish soldiers in military service abroad, Irish Catholic nationalism, and Irish diasporic identity, all of which contributed to a growing sense of Irish nationhood at mid-nineteenth century.

In this connection, the experiences of the Irish soldiers at the heart of my study highlight the fact that the ordinary Irish people as a whole were acutely aware of major events in the wider nineteenth-century world, and therefore the soldiers were ‘part of an extensive network of a transnational Ireland’.25 Recently, a wave of scholarship has challenged the notion that Ireland was inward looking and isolated during this period. This new research has argued that Ireland was well connected with the outside world, with ideas, products, and people moving freely within a transnational milieu.26 In 2013, in an important and influential edited collection

25 Anne O’Connor & Donatella Abbate Badin, ’Italia Mia: Irish-European Entanglements in the Nineteenth Century’, *Studi Irlandesi*, p. 20
26 Anne O’Connor & Donatella Abbate Badin (eds.), ’Italia Mia: Transnational Ireland in the Nineteenth Century’, *Studi Irlandesi*, pp. 17-189. See also Leon Litvack & Colin Graham (eds.), *Ireland and Europe in the Nineteenth Century*, (Dublin, 2006); Niall Whelehan (ed.), *Transnational*
entitled *Nation/Nazione: Irish Nationalism and the Italian Risorgimento*, Colin Barr and Anne O’Connor have rejected ‘the artificial division of Ireland and Europe’ and have instead sought ‘a new understanding of nation-building and identity formation in a cross-European context’. Accordingly, *Nation/Nazione* has examined ‘how the two national movements [Irish and Italian], and indeed the two peoples, interacted, observed, and influenced one another’. My work builds upon the insights of this volume in examining mid-nineteenth century Irish links with Italy, and moves even further to incorporate the United States. At the same time, my study also forms ‘part of a growing scholarship that, following the suggestions of recent transnational approaches to American history, seeks to look at transnational links and connections between the United States and other countries in the Civil War era’, as Enrico Dal Lago has recently argued. To achieve this aim, in David Gleeson and Simon Lewis’ words, we must think of the Civil War ‘not just as a local conflict but as a global one, whose causes, conditions, and consequences were all affected by transnational concerns’.

Particularly pertinent to my research, therefore, is the scholarship focusing on the transnational nature of the Italian *Risorgimento* and the American Civil War, as the framework adopted by these works is functional to the transnational examination of these two events I have utilised in my own study. There were obvious parallels, particularly the fact that both events entailed struggles for national unification, as part of a wider global age of nationalism and nation-building. However, in


28 Dal Lago, *The Age of Lincoln and Cavour*, p. 40


assessing American and Italian nation-building, Don Doyle has made the salient point that most scholarship on the growth of nationalism looks at it from the top down, as nationalism is usually assessed through the eyes of those in the upper echelons of society.\textsuperscript{32} My study instead takes Irish soldiers as representative of a growing Irish Catholic nationalism amongst ordinary Irish military men.\textsuperscript{33} Utilising these men as a guide, my approach connects transnationally and comparatively Irish nation-building to both the Italian \textit{Risorgimento} and the American Civil War, through an emphasis on the way these two historical events, in conjunction with the Fenian rebellion of 1867, were part of a series of mid-nineteenth century conflicts over democracy and nationhood.\textsuperscript{34}

Whilst some comparative analysis has been conducted on the American Civil War, less so on the Italian \textit{Risorgimento},\textsuperscript{35} sustained comparative studies of the two events together are still relatively rare, with some notable exceptions.\textsuperscript{36} My work contributes to filling this lacuna by comparing the reasons that motivated Irish soldiers who served \textit{either} in Italy \textit{or} the USA in relation to the specific features that defined Irish identity in \textit{Risorgimento} Italy and Civil War America. By drawing comparisons between the most important themes of Irish identity at mid-nineteenth century, through the analysis of their representation in the writings of militarily active Irish soldiers, my work helps to shed light on the crucial transnational features


of the process of nation-building in nineteenth-century Ireland as a whole. The three themes I mentioned earlier represent three equally important aspects of Irish Catholic identity, as it developed at home and abroad, combining together the motivating factors of Catholic religion, anti-British sentiment, and negative Irish interactions with other ethnicities, all of which contributed in a major way to a growing sense of Irish nationhood at mid-nineteenth century.

Research on the connections between nineteenth-century Irish national identity and Catholicism is well established. The political campaigns of Daniel O'Connell and the Great Famine of 1845-51 enhanced an already strong bond between the Catholic Church and the Irish people. Strengthening this connection was a ‘devotional revolution’, a campaign by Archbishop Paul Cullen (1803-78) to instil faith, orthodoxy, and obedience in the Irish people, combating a perceived non-compliance with official religious practice as dictated by Rome. In the decade leading up to the formation of the Papal Battalion, therefore, Irish nationalism was becoming increasingly Catholic in nature. In this connection, the resulting

---

transnational dimension of Roman Catholicism\textsuperscript{41} made the temporal sovereignty of the Pope an incendiary issue for Irish Catholics in 1860. However, only a few scholars have examined the links between Catholicism and Irish nationalism in the Papal Battalion. For example, Ciarán O’Carroll has argued that a mixture of religious and nationalist sentiments was a recurring theme throughout the Papal campaign, and that some Irish soldiers would have welcomed the opportunity to become Catholic martyrs, as ‘the Irish were not so much soldiers as crusaders in the fight for a Holy Cause’.\textsuperscript{42} The theme of Papal soldiers as crusading Catholic martyrs is a prevalent one in the letters I have examined, as many Irishmen wrote of their willingness to sacrifice their lives in defence of their faith. The campaign in support of the Papacy in Italy in 1860, therefore, was an obvious demonstration of both the transnational nature of Roman Catholicism and the strength and depth of Irish Catholic nationalism. Due to their sense of Irish Catholic identity, the Irish soldiers were highly motivated to travel across Europe to defend their spiritual leader, whose plight had become known to them because of the contacts between Rome and Ireland. Yet, they also believed that they represented an incipient Irish nation on the international stage.

For Union Irish soldiers, however, the religious situation they encountered in 1861 differed radically from that experienced by the men who served in Italy. As Mark Noll has highlighted, Protestantism was the most prevalent religion throughout the USA in the 1860s, and, thus, the tone of American leadership and culture was

\textsuperscript{41} See Peter R. D’Agostino, \textit{Rome in America: Transnational Catholic Ideology from the Risorgimento to Fascism}, (Chapel Hill, 2004); Colin Barr & Hilary M. Carey (eds.), \textit{Religion and Greater Ireland: Christianity and Irish Global Networks, 1750-1950}, (Montreal & Kingston, 2015); Ciaran O’Neill, \textit{Catholics of Consequence: Transnational Education, Social Mobility, and the Irish Catholic Elite 1850-1900}, (Oxford, 2014); Christopher Dowd, \textit{Rome in Australia: The Papacy and Conflict in the Australian Catholic Missions, 1834-1884}, (Leiden, 2008); Roberto Perin, \textit{Rome in Canada: The Vatican and Canadian Affairs in the Late Victorian Age}, (Toronto, 1990); Dominic Pasura & Marta Bivand Erdal (eds.), \textit{Migration, Transnationalism and Catholicism: Global Perspectives}, (Basingstoke, 2017); Gearóid Barry, \textit{The Disarmament of Hatred: Marc Sangnier, French Catholicism and the Legacy of the First World War, 1914-45}, (Basingstoke & New York, 2012). There is a relatively negligible amount of scholarship written specifically on the transnational dimension of Catholicism. This is partly due to the fact that, as Vincent Viaene has highlighted, historians have only relatively recently become aware of Catholicism’s transnational nature. Viaene has also emphasised biographies as a means of assessing transnational Catholicism, and this is a significant methodological factor in the present work. See Vincent Viaene, ‘International History, Religious History, Catholic History: Perspectives for Cross-Fertilisation (1830-1914)’, \textit{European History Quarterly}, Vol. 38, No. 4 (2008), pp. 578-607

\textsuperscript{42} Ciarán O’ Carroll, ‘The Papal Brigade of Saint Patrick’, pp. 167-187
Anglo-Saxon, liberal, and Protestant. Therefore, increasing numbers of Irish Catholic immigrants ‘challenged some of the Protestant traditions in American public life, and they did so with the growing power of the Catholic Church in America. Archbishop John Hughes of New York dreamed of uniting the Catholics of America to improve the church and their lives’. At the same time, there was less of a moral dilemma for Irish soldiers, as there was no internal threat to Pope Pius IX. In contrast with the experience in Italy, Irish Catholics in America willingly fought for the aim of national unification with the Union Army. Though their religion was a major part of their lives, Irish Catholic soldiers were less concerned with using it to rationalise and justify their involvement in the American Civil War. Instead, they obsessed about the need for Catholic priests in Irish units and sometimes used their religious contacts to seek career advancement. Ultimately, Irish Catholicism served a more important role in Italy than in America. In Italy, the Irish soldiers believed that they were serving a holy and noble cause, while in America they were more concerned with protecting the country from all perceived enemies, including Britain. In large part, this was due to the example of the USA as a successful republic, which was an inspiration to those who believed in a future independent Irish nation.

In this connection, anti-British sentiment was also prevalent in nineteenth-century Ireland, and it grew stronger during the Great Irish Famine and the 1850s. Exacerbating this situation, by 1860, was the perceived British support of Italian nationhood, at a time when Britain denied the same right to the Irish, which helped to drive Irish nationalism and Irish Catholicism closer together. The intense anti-Catholicism and anti-Papal sentiments espoused by the British press also encouraged

---


44 Bruce, *The Harp and the Eagle*, p. 23

45 Miller, ‘Catholic Religion, Irish Ethnicity, and the Civil War’, pp. 261-296


48 Raponi, *Religion and Politics in the Risorgimento*
Irishmen to support the Papal cause. The writings of the Papal Battalion soldiers I have analysed express anti-British opinions frequently. Therefore, both a strong sense of Irish identity intrinsically linked to Catholicism, and a strong animosity towards Britain, were primary factors that motivated young Irishmen to volunteer for the Papal Battalion.

In America, some Union Irish soldiers saw their emigration as forced expulsion or banishment, caused by the brutality of the British in Ireland. On arrival in America, many Irish soldiers found that a level of antipathy towards Britain already existed there, due in part to the clashes between the two countries during the American Revolution and the War of 1812, and also to Britain’s ongoing attempts to inhibit US territorial aggrandisement on the North American continent. Paraphrasing nineteenth-century British politician John Bright, Don Doyle has offered a further reason, stating that ‘Britain had played an ancient and shameful role in creating the [Civil War] by its role in introducing slavery into the American colonies’. Irish soldiers in the Union Army exhibited a similar contempt of Britain in their letters home. Some of them went further, viewing their service in the Union Army as a training ground for a future war of Ireland against Britain. As David Sim has stated, ‘Irish nationalists used the United States as a base from which to contest Ireland’s partnership in the Anglo-Irish Union. And more than this, many hoped to connect their own aspirations for an independent, republican, Ireland with the growing power of the American republic’. Many Union Irish soldiers even felt that both Ireland and the United States were under threat from Britain. Therefore, Irish animosity towards Britain played a much more influential part in motivating Irish soldiers in the Union Army than it had in the Papal Battalion. At the same time, though, by representing Irish nationhood abroad in opposition to the perceived aims
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51 Kerby A. Miller, Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America, (New York, 1985); Miller, “‘Revenge for Skibbereen’”, pp. 180-195
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of the British government, both the Irish soldiers in the Papal Battalion and those in the Union Army were part of a process of Irish nation-building at mid-nineteenth century.

Similarly to Irish Catholic nationalism and anti-British sentiment, ethnic interactions between the Irish on one side, and the citizens of the Papal States and Piedmontese soldiers on the other, have also been analysed by scholars, though not to a great extent. There were clear examples of prejudice exhibited by the residents of the Papal States towards the Irish soldiers who arrived in 1860 in the hope of defending the temporal power of Pope Pius IX. In fact, many citizens of the Papal States were supportive of Italian unification, and viewed the Papal Army as mercenary outsiders. Anne O’Connor has argued that this animosity was mutual, given that the Irish soldiers of the Papal Battalion equally despised the Papal States residents, since the latter did not welcome them as potential saviours. The Irish felt similarly also towards the soldiers of the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia against whom they fought, though there were at least a few isolated instances of mutual respect between the two military foes. My study builds on the limited previous scholarship in this area in assessing the attitudes of Irishmen in the Papal Battalion towards both the inhabitants of the Papal States and the Piedmontese soldiers and generals. In Italy, as later in America, there was tension between the Irish soldiers and other ethnic groups. Only in America, however, the Irish soldiers viewed another ethnic group, specifically African Americans, as a direct threat to their long-term economic survival.

Thus, ethnic interaction, overall, was a much more influential factor among the Union Irish soldiers than among the Irish soldiers in the Papal Battalion. The study of ‘whiteness’ – of how different ethnic groups in the United States came to identify themselves, and be identified by others, as white - has become an important facet of research on immigration into the United States in recent years. Noel Ignatiev’s How the Irish Became White (1995) first highlighted how the Irish

55 The most important of the limited examples are O’Connor, “Giant and Brutal Islanders’, pp. 96-109; and Cryan, The Irish and English in Italy’s Risorgimento, pp. 36-132
57 O’Connor, “Giant and Brutal Islanders’, pp. 96-109
confronted a strong anti-immigrant movement in the USA, which influenced the development of their identity by forcing them to assert their ‘whiteness’ as a factor that placed them above other ethnic groups, notably black people, in America’s social ladder. The Irish, including the Irish soldiers, defined themselves by their whiteness, and in explicit opposition to African Americans, whom they despised and denigrated at every opportunity. By adopting this attitude, Union Irish soldiers were guilty of ‘participating in a politics of white supremacy’. As Christian Samito highlights, however, the Irish as a group ‘were the first white population in the United States to face significant challenges to their racial identity, and to their presence in the country in general’. Many Americans were suspicious of Irish Catholic soldiers, deeming them untrustworthy and incompatible with American republican values, mainly due to their religion and loyalty to the Pope. Participation in the American Civil War allowed the Union Irish soldiers to challenge these conventional racial and ethnic views. In the eyes of those Irishmen who fought for the Union, there could be no greater declaration of loyalty to a country than the willingness to give one’s life for it. Union Irish soldiers felt that, by protecting the ‘global bastion of republicanism’, they were also striking a blow both for Ireland as a potential new republic and for the Irish in the USA. In both Italy and in America, therefore, Irish soldiers responded to anti-Irish prejudice by asserting more forcefully and explicitly their Irish identity and a growing sense of Irish nationalism.


Samito, Becoming American Under Fire, pp. 6-21. See also Doyle, The Cause of All Nations, pp. 85-105
In my work, I have treated the subjects of my analysis avoiding a restrictive national interpretive framework, in the hope of better understanding the life stories of the Irish soldiers within a broader transnational and comparative context. In Hartmut Kaelble’s words, ‘the history of a nation cannot be understood when the writing is limited only to its national history’. By studying the transnational lives of my selected group of Irish soldiers, I have aimed to present the reader with a far greater contextualisation of the concepts and personal narratives of a ‘history from below’ of both the Irish experience in opposition to Italian unification and of Irish participation in the Union in the American Civil War. Ultimately, this study reveals the importance of flows and connections of ideas and concepts, which transcended national borders and were central to the lives of the subjects of my research. Transnational links between nineteenth-century Ireland, Italy, and the United States, which hitherto may have seemed too tenuous and speculative for scholarly comment, are constantly emerging through new scholarship, and my own work confirms the significance of these findings. This new scholarship and transnational approach aids us greatly to reach a better understanding of the Italian Risorgimento, the American Civil War, and the 1867 Fenian rebellion in a global context, by avoiding viewing these events in isolation.

Methodologically, therefore, my study adopts a twofold approach, at once transnational and comparative. I utilise a transnational methodology specifically in Chapter Two in order to assess the writings of Irish soldiers who served in both Italy and America during the 1860s. In his recent seminal edited collection Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History (2015), Niall Whelehan has described transnational history as a ‘way of seeing’, or a new perspective on historical topics which transcends the current rigidity prescribed by demarked national boundaries. Previously propagated especially by Pierre-Yves Saunier and Akira Iriye, this type of transnational perspective is meant to complement national
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history, not replace it. Whelehan terms this ‘playing with scales’, by assessing how the local, national and transnational all relate to one another. Building on the example of the above scholars, I view the young Irish Catholic soldiers at the heart of my research beyond their national context of Ireland, aiming at a better understanding of their historical milieu through a transnational perspective focused on their relationship with a wider world that included both Italy and America in the 1860s. Chronologically, I follow the military experiences of the Irish soldiers to analyse the transnational links revealed by their surviving letters. As Whelehan has asserted, ‘studying transnational lives and biographies is […] an excellent means to understand wider contexts’. Following these suggestions, I intend to reveal the specific transnational connections that were central to the lives of the Irish soldiers in Italy and America in the 1860s. These, in turn, were part of the wider links between nineteenth-century Ireland, Italy, and the United States, epitomised by the specific Irish military experience abroad that I have analysed.

Using the transnational method to assess examples of biographies from the Irish diaspora, as the life stories of the Irish soldiers were, encourages the reader to view Irish migration in a new light. My argument is that the Irishmen at the centre of my study challenge the popular stereotypes of nineteenth-century Irish migrants, since they arrived at their destination not impoverished and unskilled, but relatively well off as professional soldiers. Thus, the life stories of these Irish soldiers allows my work to heed Kevin Kenny’s warning about ‘flattening diversity’, and avoid claiming that the entire Irish diaspora was one cohesive and unchanging entity. This becomes immediately apparent when one views the diverse experiences of mid-

65 Akira Iriye & Pierre-Yves Saunier (eds.), The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History, (Basingstoke, 2009)
66 Primary sources pertaining to relevant Irish soldiers I treat in my study are housed at Irish, Italian and US archives, including the Diocesan Archives and the National Library of Ireland in Dublin, the Pontifical Irish College in Rome, the Archives of the Archdiocese of New York, New York Public Library, and New York Historical Society in New York, Boston Public Library in Boston, and the Library of Congress in Washington D.C.
nineteenth century Irish immigrant soldiers within the transnational context of the Italian Risorgimento and the American Civil War.

Together with the transnational method, I also utilise a comparative approach, particularly in Chapters Three, Four, and Five. In comparative history, ‘two or more historical phenomena are systematically studied for similarities and differences in order to contribute to their better description, explanation, and interpretation’.\(^6^9\) Put simply, this method analyses parallels and contrasts between societies or individuals amidst either substantially different or shared similar conditions. In the three comparative chapters, my study contrasts the conflicting experiences of a range of Irish-born soldiers who engaged in warfare either in Italy or in America, but not in both. Thus, chronologically, I analyse the letters and other writings of the Irish soldiers in order to assess comparatively the soldiers’ composite identity, focusing on three themes that most influenced their motivations and sense of Irish nationalism.\(^7^0\) In doing so, I draw specific comparisons between the attitudes of Irish soldiers in Italy and in America in relation to the main themes related to their reasons for enlisting: Irish Catholic nationalism, anti-British sentiment, and ethnic interaction. Ultimately, comparison enhances our understanding of these three core themes within the two very different contexts of the Italian Risorgimento and the American Civil War. The end result is the acquisition of ‘insights into each particular case that would have remained unrevealed had they been studied in isolation’,\(^7^1\) as in the case of the constituent elements of the Irish nationalism epitomised by the Irish soldiers who served either in Italy or in America in the 1860s.

My thesis is structured as follows. Chapter One frames the overall study by explaining relevant events and the historical contexts of Ireland, Italy, and the United States during the 1850s and 1860s. In Chapter Two, I introduce the transnational element of this work, as I examine connections between the three countries. Utilising the Irish soldiers’ military service as a framework, I focus on specific transnational
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topics such as Catholicism, Irish foreign military service, Fenianism, and Irish nationalism, all of which contributed to the wider process of Irish nation-building in the nineteenth-century. In Chapter Three, I begin implementing a comparative approach, by analysing how Catholicism affected the Irish soldiers’ motivations in Italy and America, while focusing on the issue of Papal temporal sovereignty. In both the Union and Italy, Catholic religion was an important element of Irish identity. Only in Italy, however, was Catholicism used as a justification for volunteering to serve in a foreign army. Chapter Four focuses on anti-British sentiment amongst Irish soldiers in Italy and in the Union. The Irish carried a bitterness towards the British to Italy and especially to America, where it motivated the developing Fenian movement, while military service in the Union army provided the training for many of them to fight in Ireland in 1867. Chapter Five analyses Irish interactions with other ethnic groups in Italy and America. It focuses on relations between the Irish, the residents of the Papal States, and the Piedmontese soldiers in Italy in 1860, and between the Irish, white Protestant Americans, and African Americans in the Union in 1861-1865. Finally, the Conclusion summarises the transnational and comparative elements of my study, taking a more in-depth look at the links between the soldiers’ Irish Catholic nationalism and the growth of the Irish Republican Brotherhood (the Fenians), and placing the Irish soldiers’ legacy within the context of a wider process of Irish nation-building in the nineteenth-century.
CHAPTER ONE

Ireland, Italy, and America, 1860-67: Why Irishmen became soldiers

This chapter examines relevant mid-nineteenth century historical events in Ireland, Italy, and America in order to understand the world of the Irish soldiers at the heart of this study. It focuses primarily on 1860-67, with brief pertinent information on the 1850s. The aim is to contextualise the Italian Risorgimento, the American Civil War, and the Fenian rebellion in Ireland, insofar as they relate to topics and themes which potentially motivated and influenced transnationally the Irish soldiers, while also revealing nineteenth-century commonalities between the three geographical regions. This chapter, thus, is necessarily transnational in scope, as it seeks to highlight the theme of movement of people and ideas across Europe and North America, in the same way that Irish soldiers travelled from place to place serving various armies and causes.

The first section briefly examines 1850s Ireland and Britain, as the Irish soldiers who served in Italy and America in the 1860s grew up in Ireland as British subjects. The focus is on an increasing sense of Irish nationalism imbued throughout with a Catholic ethos, and a bitterness towards Britain and its people, particularly due to the events of the Great Irish Famine of 1845-51. These themes motivated young Irishmen and their decision to travel to Italy in 1860. The second section of this chapter outlines events in Italy in the lead up to the 1860 conflict, which resulted in 1,300 Irish soldiers joining the Battalion of St Patrick in an ultimately futile effort to prevent the loss of the Papal States by the Papacy. The chapter then examines the USA, both before and during the American Civil War, highlighting how the war affected Union Irish soldiers. In America, Irishmen were forced to take on a defensive role, verbally attacking perceived enemies such as American nativists, African-Americans and the British. Finally, this chapter recounts the events of the Fenian rebellion in Ireland in 1867, as many Irish soldiers who had served in Italy and/or America in the 1860s also partook in the failed Fenian uprising in their homeland two years after the end of the Civil War. Despite the rebellion’s lack of success, the Irish soldiers’ representation of their country abroad had already served to strengthen future Irish claims to nationhood. Whether at home or internationally, the Irish soldiers were enhancing an Irish version of Benedict Anderson’s ‘imagined
community’, due to the fact that an unofficial Irish nation already existed in the minds of many patriotic young Irishmen like them.¹

**Ireland in the 1850s: Irish Catholic nationalism² and anti-British sentiment**

Ireland and Britain in the 1850s both shaped and motivated the men at the heart of this study. Growing up in Ireland, many of them were strongly influenced by the increasing power of the Catholic Church.³ The return of Paul Cullen from Rome at the beginning of the 1850s was a significant milestone.⁴ Cullen, who ‘seethed with everything that went to make up the mentality of an Irish Catholic nationalist’, attempted to strengthen the influence of the Catholic Church on the Irish people.⁵ The ‘devotional revolution’⁶ that he initiated was ‘a movement that emphasised formal, prescribed worship practices; the status and central role of the parish priest; and the authority of the church hierarchy’.⁷ Cullen worked tirelessly to bring the Irish clergy and the ordinary people in line with Roman practices.⁸ Partly as a result
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of Cullen’s efforts, clerical numbers doubled, and Mass attendance rose dramatically. By 1860, when young Irishmen joined the Papal Battalion to fight for Pope Pius IX, Cullen’s ‘devotional revolution’ had considerably strengthened the connection between Irish identity and Catholicism.9

Across the Irish Sea, meanwhile, the Catholic Church in Britain was almost completely Irish in composition, leading to a relatively high level of anti-Catholicism in Victorian Britain.10 In the words of Enda Delaney ‘anti-Catholicism was a central component of British national identity in the middle of the nineteenth century, ranging from street-level ‘no popery’ agitation, which reached its peak in the early 1850s, to long-held suspicions about the aspirations of Rome to influence British affairs’.11 The growing revival of Catholicism in Britain, and Irish Catholic migration into the region, left British Protestants fearing a direct attack on the authority of the British Crown by the Papacy. Exacerbating these tensions, and the fear of Irish Catholics and Catholicism, was the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in Britain in 1850.12 This trepidation increased support in Britain for the Italian Risorgimento in the hope that the movement for Italian national unification would
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weaken or possibly even destroy the Papacy and Roman Catholicism completely. British Prime Minister Lord Palmerston considered that an Italian Reformation may even have been possible, and evangelical British Protestant groups sent missionaries, bibles, and financial support to Italy in the 1850s and into the 1860s in the hope of bringing this about. A strong popular support for the forces of Italian unification ranged against the Papacy also emerged in British industrial cities that had seen a huge influx of Catholic Irish, such as Liverpool, London, Glasgow, and Birmingham. This animosity towards Irish Catholics played a role in increasing both recruitment and levels of anti-British sentiment amongst Irish soldiers in both Italy in 1860 and in America in 1861 to 1865.

Britain’s support of Italian unification and independence, whilst denying the same right to the Irish, also helped to enhance the link between Irish nationalism and Catholicism. In 1860, British help to the forces involved in the Italian Risorgimento included both financial and military elements, as a number of British men fought on the Garibaldian side in Garibaldi’s expedition to Sicily, and further antagonised many Irish Catholics. The vociferous support for, and positive portrayal of, Garibaldi in the British press, along with fundraising on his behalf, resulted in heightened resentment in Ireland. Anne O’Connor has argued that the intense anti-Catholicism and anti-Papal sentiments espoused in the British press galvanised public opinion in Ireland and encouraged the Irish people to rally around

18 Lucy Riall, Garibaldi: Invention of a Hero, (New Haven, 2007), pp. 294-302
the Papal cause.\textsuperscript{19} On occasion, Irish soldiers in Italy expressed anti-British sentiments, sometimes finding themselves cautioned by their superiors as a result.\textsuperscript{20} Events in Italy also exacerbated the Catholic-Protestant fault line at home in Ireland, as both sides adopted opposing positions at odds with those they held in regard to Ireland. The strength of their religious beliefs and love for the Pope forced Irish Catholics, in the words of Jennifer O’Brien, ‘to take up positions on Italian affairs that were inconsistent with their ideological stances on Irish issues’.\textsuperscript{21} Irish Catholics denied Italy its nationhood, an aim many Irish cherished at home. They repudiated the right to Italian independence, even though they had a similar wish to dispense with British power in Ireland. Therefore, both a strong sense of Irish identity intrinsically linked to Catholicism and an animosity towards Britain were primary factors that motivated young Irishmen to volunteer for the Papal Battalion in 1860, and also contributed to intensifying the belief amongst many of them that they were international representatives of a staunchly Catholic Irish nation.

\textbf{Italy in 1860}

By 1860, Irish interaction with Italy ‘was complex as many reactions were mediated by Catholicism which viewed Italian unification as an attack on the position of the Catholic Church’.\textsuperscript{22} The lack of empathy between Catholics in Ireland and in Italy was, however, understandable to a degree. In the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia, the schism between Italian nationalism and the Catholic Church had deepened throughout the 1850s. The Piedmontese government asserted the supremacy of state over church, thereby weakening the power of the Papacy and Catholicism in the region. Prime Minister Camillo Benso, Count of Cavour,\textsuperscript{23} introduced a number of reforms on coming to power in 1852 which primarily aimed at modernising Piedmont, but also severely limited the power of the Catholic Church in the kingdom.\textsuperscript{24} Throughout the remainder of the decade, ‘anticlericalism became a

\textsuperscript{19} Anne O'Connor, 'That dangerous serpent: Garibaldi and Ireland 1860–1870', \textit{Modern Italy}, Vol. 15, No. 4 (November 2010), pp. 401-415
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\textsuperscript{22} Anne O’Connor & Donatella Abbate Badin, ‘Italia Mia: Irish-European Entanglements in the Nineteenth Century’, \textit{Studi Irlandesi}, No. 6 (2016), p. 21
mass movement in Piedmont’. The Piedmontese press reported many instances of clerical misconduct in Italy and the wider world, including the alleged sexual abuse and murder of children. As the 1850s progressed, anticlericalism and anti-Catholicism became almost indistinguishable in Piedmont-Sardinia, as Catholicism was considered anachronistic and incapable of change.25

As these reforms progressed, the Piedmontese assumed the leading role in the drive towards Italian unification in the late 1850s, though Cavour and King Victor Emmanuel II were predominantly interested only in controlling northern Italy.26 In April 1859, Austria declared war on the Piedmontese, after a series of provocative actions by Cavour, including attempts to foment rebellion in Austrian controlled areas. The Piedmontese, along with their French ally Napoleon III, defeated the Austrians in battles at Solferino and Magenta, and the war was over within two months.27 By mid-1860, the Piedmontese were in control of a large part of the north and centre of the Italian peninsula, as the Duchies of Parma and Modena, the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, and the area of Romagna, had all voted in plebiscites to be annexed to Piedmont-Sardinia.28 These annexations were granted immediate international recognition by the British government.29 The territorial gains made by Piedmont, and the defeat of Catholic Austria, highlighted to other Catholic countries throughout Europe, including Ireland, the conflicting aspirations of Italian nationalists and the Catholic Church, as well as the fragility of the Pope’s hold on the Papal States.

By 1860, many in Italy and beyond believed that the Italian peninsula should only be united as one single kingdom under Victor Emmanuel II, thereby rejecting prior compromise notions of a federation of Italian states. The concept of a
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federation presided over by the Pope had had some support in Italy since the early 1840s. This notion had been popularised in an important book entitled On the Moral and Civil Primacy of the Italians (1843), written by Piedmontese cleric Vincenzo Gioberti. Gioberti believed that Roman Catholicism and the Papacy were to lead the national revival of Italy. He called for the establishment of an Italian confederation under the leadership of the Pope. A federation such as that proposed by Gioberti saw union as the ultimate goal, but also ensuring the survival of regional states and the rule of their monarchs, including the Pope, who held sovereignty over Rome. Those in favour of this aim desired above all to prevent the outbreak of conflict between any future Italian state and the Catholic Church. Had it been successful, this programme of a Papacy-led federation of Italian states would have rendered unnecessary the arrival of Irish Catholic volunteers in Italy in 1860. The hope for an Italian federation under the leadership of Pius IX was dashed, however, as the Pope withdrew his support for the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia in its war against Catholic Austria in 1848, and publicly renounced any claim to the leadership of a future Italian federation. The subsequent revolutions of 1848-49 confirmed the Pope’s position, as he maintained power only through French support.

In principle, since Italy was home to the Holy See, it represented the centre of the Catholic universe. By the 1850s, however, the power of the Church had to be limited throughout the Italian peninsula if unification was to be completed successfully. This realisation ended any hopes of reconciliation between the Catholic Church and Italian nationalism. The results of this were also felt in Ireland, as Irish Catholics found themselves unable to support Italian nationalists due to the latter’s wish to remove the Papal States from the control of the Papacy and
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incorporate them into a newly unified Italian kingdom.\textsuperscript{35} Irish Catholics felt that the Pope could only be free to perform his spiritual duties if his temporal power remained unchanged.\textsuperscript{36} As George Berkeley explained, in the eyes of an Irish Catholic in 1860, ‘an attack made on the Papacy represented not merely a blow struck against the institution which he most revered, but also a change which he feared might indirectly affect his own country by weakening one of the sources of its moral strength’.\textsuperscript{37} Therefore, protecting the Pope also meant protecting Ireland and its religion which defined Irish identity for the majority.\textsuperscript{38}

Thus, there was an influx of Irish soldiers to the Papal States in the early summer of 1860, as a result of a concerted campaign by the Catholic Church in Ireland to provide assistance for their spiritual leader in his time of need. Termed ‘the Last Crusade’ by some, this campaign developed in three distinct stages.\textsuperscript{39} Firstly, the Catholic Church attempted to make Irish Catholics aware of the situation in which the Pope found himself. They did this by organising large gatherings at which petitions were signed in favour of Pius IX and his ownership of the Papal States, and emphasising the fact that, in the eyes of the Irish Catholic Church, the Pope’s spiritual authority depended on his temporal sovereignty.\textsuperscript{40} In other words, the Papacy needed to be politically independent to ensure its spiritual independence. Secondly, the Irish bishops began a fundraising effort that eventually produced the impressive sum of £80,000 for the Pope, most of it being channelled to the Vatican via the Pontifical Irish College in Rome. The third and final stage in this campaign involved the raising of an army known as the Papal Battalion of St Patrick. The men, travelling in groups of twenty or thirty, began to arrive in Rome from May 1860. On reaching Italy, they officially enlisted in the Papal Army. The latter also included
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nine other nationalities, all of which were under the overall command of a Frenchman, General Louis Christophe de Lamoricière.41

The Irishmen who travelled to Italy unsurprisingly expressed a strong religious tone in their communications, and rarely, if at all, did they exhibit any lack of faith in their cause. For the majority, there was seldom any doubt that their spiritual leader Pope Pius IX was in the right. The role of Catholicism in Italian cultural identity also had no effect on the Irish response to events in Italy.42 The fact that the people that the Irish soldiers would fight against were Catholics, at least nominally, does not appear to have caused them to doubt the legitimacy of their cause. Also, this was not just an endeavour supported by the approximately 1,300 Irishmen who travelled to Italy. Many more young men desired to enlist and serve Pope Pius IX, but, for a variety of reasons, they were discouraged from doing so.43 It is clear, therefore, from the widespread show of support at home, including the raising of £80,000 less than a decade after the Famine ended, that the eyes of most Irish Catholics were concentrated solely and exclusively on what was best for Rome and the Papacy.

By July 1860, Italian nationalist Giuseppe Garibaldi and his ‘Thousand’ had succeeded in taking control of the island of Sicily. Crossing over to mainland Italy,

43 William Keane claimed that instructions from the Catholic hierarchy in Dublin were preventing any more volunteers from leaving for Italy, though he asserts that many thousands more were prepared to go. See William Keane to Monsignor Tobias Kirby, Fermoy, 31 August 1860, The Kirby Collection, KIR/1836-1861/2745, PICR
Garibaldi and his men fought their way up the peninsula, overwhelming the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies by September. These actions added to Garibaldi’s already immense popularity in both Britain and the USA, but left him further despised in Ireland, as ‘Garibaldi aimed to secure the liberation of the south and the unification of Italy’ with the ultimate aim of liberating Rome from the Pope. Garibaldi, thus, declared his intention to march on Rome, which was defended by French soldiers, and therefore this was an act that could have triggered a wider European war. On 11 September, troops of the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia invaded the Papal States to prevent Garibaldi’s attack on the Pope’s territories. The Piedmontese also aimed to take control of the south of Italy, thereby uniting the peninsula. Thus, as Lucy Riall states, ‘in order to control the apparent inevitability of national unification, Cavour was forced to become its main architect’.

The Papal Army volunteers’ first engagement with the Piedmontese enemy occurred on 13 September 1860 at Perugia. The Papal Army, including about 150 Irishmen under the command of Captain James Blackney, was vastly outnumbered, since the Piedmontese comprised around 12,000 men. Some of the city’s residents opened one of the gates to admit the Piedmontese soldiers, thereby revealing their support for Italian unification, in contrast with the Irish soldiers’ belief that they would be welcomed as heroes by the citizens of the Papal States. According to Patrick Keyes O’Clery, the Irish soldiers, ‘true to their national character [...] did what they could to secure a continuance of the defence, but it was in vain. Sixteen of them cut their way out, rather than surrender’. The rest of the garrison was forced to capitulate, and the Papal troops were taken prisoner. Four days later, the Papal

---


48 Riall, Garibaldi, pp. 207-268; Riall, Risorgimento, pp. 32-36; Lucy Riall, ‘Garibaldi and the South’, pp. 132-153

49 Patrick Keyes O’Clery, The Making of Italy, (London, 1892), p. 192
Army, including 350 Irishmen under Major Myles O’Reilly, fought against 2,500 Piedmontese troops at Spoleto. The soldiers withstood repeated attacks for fourteen hours, but were eventually forced to surrender. The most important engagement of this brief conflict took place at Castelfidardo on 18 September. The Papal Army attempted to reach its base at Ancona, but was intercepted and subsequently defeated by 17,000 Piedmontese troops under the command of General Enrico Cialdini. Overall success in the battle for possession of the Papal States was assured for the Piedmontese army after the victory at Castelfidardo, as they ‘crushed the little Papal Army by mere brute strength and force of numbers’. After a brief siege of Ancona, the entire Papal Army surrendered. Subsequently, the Piedmontese marched south, avoiding Rome and its French contingent, and Garibaldi yielded the territories he had conquered to King Victor Emanuel II in October at Teano, near Naples. At this point, the Italian peninsula was unified, with the exception of Rome and the province of Venetia, both of which became incorporated eventually into the Italian kingdom at a later stage.

The captured Irish soldiers were marched to Genoa and held there as prisoners. A committee was formed in Ireland with the intention of gathering donations to repatriate the men back to Ireland. Meetings were held throughout the country to raise subscriptions to this end. On 20 October, a Papal ship began to transfer the men from Genoa to Marseilles. From here, they made their way to Paris and on to Le Havre, where eventually another ship was located to take them back to Ireland. Most of the men of the Papal Battalion eventually arrived in Ireland through Queenstown in Cork (modern day Cobh). On their return, they received a hero’s welcome. Alexander Martin Sullivan wrote that ‘had those men been victors on a hundred fields they could not have been welcomed with more flattering demonstrations’. Trains took the men from Cork City to various parts of Ireland.

---

50 Crean, ‘The Irish Battalion of St Patrick at the Defence of Spoleto, September 1860’, pp. 52-60 & 99-107
52 O’Clery, The Making of Italy, p. 219
53 Riall, Garibaldi, pp. 207-224; Duggan, The Force of Destiny, pp. 198-213
every stop along the way, large groups of people turned out to see them. According

to George Berkeley, ‘they had made sacrifices not only for the Papal cause, but also

for the cause of nationality in Ireland’. In other words, the Irish soldiers’ service

had strengthened the cause of an independent Irish nation on the international stage

as they were seen as an unofficial Irish army, and they considered themselves to be

representing their country outside its borders - a claim also frequently made by

Union Irish soldiers during and after the American Civil War.

Irish soldiers in the American Civil War, 1861-65

Following defeat in Italy in 1860, most Papal Battalion veterans preferred to

either remain in official military service for the Pope in Rome or elsewhere (as long

as they would not have to serve in the British Army), or to return to a normal civilian

life. A unit named the Company of St Patrick was formed from the Irishmen who

stayed behind in Rome, and it was later absorbed into the Papal Zouaves, which

continued the ultimately futile defence of the remnants of the Papal States until 1870

when the Italian army eventually captured Rome. Some Papal Battalion veterans

chose to continue their military careers in Civil War America, where they joined

other Irish and Irish American soldiers in either the Union or the Confederacy. According to Philip Paludan, ‘every Northern state with a large Irish population

contributed companies – staffed by Irishmen, with Catholic chaplains and decorated

uniforms or flags with symbols of Ireland’. For example, units such as the 23

nd

Illinois and the 10

th

Ohio Infantry, with large numbers of Irish, served the Union

cause. The most famous Irish unit in the Union was the Irish Brigade, which came

into existence through the efforts of former Irish rebel Thomas Francis Meagher. The

Civil War offered Irishmen ‘the opportunity to claim respect as American citizens, to

57 Berkeley, The Irish Battalion in the Papal Army of 1860, p. 220
60 Phillip Shaw Paludan, A People’s Contest: The Union & Civil War, 1861-1865, (Kansas, 1996), p. 21
undo the stigma that nativism had attached to them of being aliens unfit for this society.\footnote{Paludan, \textit{A People’s Contest}, p. 282}

The Irish had been the victims of British racial prejudice in Ireland, but when they arrived in the USA, many of them became the oppressors, specifically of African Americans. They also, however, remained the victims of white American prejudice. In this, they were in the unique position of being both victims and perpetrators of racial oppression in the United States.\footnote{In this, I am going against the prevalent notion of whiteness studies, as I am saying that the Irish were both victims and perpetrators, while scholars such as Noel Ignatiev believe the Irish were mainly oppressors.} By the outbreak of the American Civil War in 1861,\footnote{For an overview of the American Civil War, see especially Susan-Mary Grant, \textit{The War for a Nation: The American Civil War}, (New York, 2006); Allen C. Guelzo, \textit{Fateful Lightning: A New History of the Civil War and Reconstruction}, (New York, 2012); James McPherson, \textit{Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era}, (New York, 1988); Brooks D. Simpson, \textit{America’s Civil War}, (Arlington Heights, 2009); Adam P. Smith, \textit{The American Civil War} (New York, 2007); Gary W. Gallagher, \textit{The American Civil War: This Mighty Scourge of War}, (Oxford, 2003)} Irish immigrants in the United States had experienced ethnic hostility and anti-Irish prejudice for many years. Anti-Irish sentiment had reached its peak in the 1850s, as by this time two-fifths of all foreign born in America were Irish.\footnote{Kevin Kenny, \textit{The American Irish: A History}, (Harlow, 2000); Kerby A. Miller, \textit{Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America}, (New York 1985); Dale T. Knobel, America for the Americans: The Nativist Movement in the United States, (London, 1996); Dale T. Knobel, \textit{Paddy and the Republic: Ethnicity and Nationality in Antebellum America}, (Middletown, 1986): Hidetaka Hirota, \textit{Expelling the Poor: Atlantic Seaboard States and the Nineteenth-Century Origins of American Immigration Policy}, (New York, 2017)} Many crowded into tenements in cities such as New York and Boston, where they suffered from disease, mental illness and depression.\footnote{Alan M. Kraut, ‘Illness and Medical Care among Irish Immigrants in Antebellum New York’, in Ronald H. Bayor & Timothy J. Meagher (eds.), \textit{The New York Irish}, (Baltimore, 1997), pp. 153-168} With a subsequent increase in crime and welfare rates, the Irish also accounted for a disproportionate number of those admitted in poorhouses or arrested. Many in the United States blamed the increased levels of crime and disease on immigrants, especially from Ireland. This prejudice manifested itself throughout the 1850s, in newspapers, in the political sphere, and in daily life in urban and rural areas, as had also been the case in Britain.\footnote{Curtis Jr., \textit{Anglo-Saxons and Celts}; Curtis Jr., \textit{Apes and Angels}; De Nie, \textit{The Eternal Paddy}} The Irish, however, did not suffer to the same extent as the African Americans or the Chinese.\footnote{See especially David R. Roediger, \textit{The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class}, (London, 1999); Lon Kurashige, \textit{Two Faces of Exclusion: The Untold History of Anti-Asian Racism in the United States}, (Chapel Hill, 2016); Andrew Gyory, \textit{Closing the Gate: Race, Politics, and the Chinese Exclusion Act}, (Chapel Hill, 1998); Reginald Horsman, \textit{Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism}, (Cambridge & London, 1981); Knobel,
the United States, they were never denied citizenship or freedom. Thus, being ‘free whites’ gave the Irish certain rights, such as the vote for adult males. No settlement restrictions prevented the Irish from moving internally in the United States. Many Americans, therefore, while considering the Irish backward and uneducated, believed that it would be possible to ‘civilise’ the Irish immigrants at some point in the future.68

Malcolm Campbell has highlighted the main pillars upholding and unifying the Irish in mid-nineteenth century America, which were represented by the Catholic Church and Irish American nationalism. The latter was exemplified by the organisations with Irish nationalist motivations which appeared in the United States in the 1850s, especially the Emmet Monument Society and the Irish Emigrant Aid Society.69 The Fenian Brotherhood was founded by former Young Irelander John O’Mahony in 1859 as a support movement for the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB), which had been established in Ireland by James Stephens.70 The Fenians held ‘the conviction that the Irish people wanted separation and that [they] had the incontestable and inviolable right to get it for them by force of arms’.71 Freedom from Britain was to be achieved by violent insurrection, while constitutional politics were largely despised and rejected. The Brotherhood quickly formed regiments of Irishmen who drilled regularly, especially in New York, with vague ambitions of a future invasion to free Ireland from British rule. Many of these men later formed the nucleus of the Union Army’s Irish Brigade during the American Civil War, where

---

their aims for Irish independence became more focused and tangible. A number of survivors from the Civil War returned to Ireland in 1865 and 1866 to begin preparations for a planned rising, emphasising the transnational nature of nineteenth-century Irish Catholic nationalism.72 The Irish soldiers’ sense of being both Catholic and Irish sustained and defined them in the Union army, ensuring that the fate of their homeland was always prominent in their priorities.

Some of the Irishmen who feature prominently in this study had either not arrived in the United States, or had not yet enlisted in the Union army, by the time of the First Battle of Bull Run in July 1861, particularly those individuals who had previously served in Italy. Soldiers Michael Smith, John Mulhall, and Michael Luther probably entered America through New York City in late 1861 or 1862. Myles Keogh and Daniel Keily travelled there together in 1862.73 John Gleeson and Patrick Clooney were exceptions in their early arrival. The former joined the Union Army in New York in May 1861, while Clooney arrived in July 1861. It is possible that some or all of the men were motivated to travel to America and enlist following the attack on Fort Sumter in April 1861 and President Abraham Lincoln’s subsequent call for volunteers.74 Other Irish participants were already in America, and had been for varying lengths of time by the beginning of the American Civil War. Thomas Francis Meagher75 had been in the US since 1852, and Michael Corcoran since 1849. Others had been born either in the United States, Canada or Britain from Irish descent (such as Peter Welsh and Thomas Francis Galwey), and

---


The year 1862 was to be eventful for the men of the Papal Battalion who had enlisted in the Union Army. Daniel Keily survived when he was severely wounded at the Battle of Port Republic in Virginia in June, but he sustained horrific facial injuries. In August, John Coppinger was shot through the neck at the Second Battle of Bull Run. He also survived, but spent the next six months recuperating. One of the earliest arrivals from Italy to join the Union Army, Patrick Clooney, was not so lucky. He became the first of the small cohort of men from whose experiences this study draws many transnational conclusions to die during the American Civil War. Clooney was killed at the Battle of Antietam in September 1862, having been shot a number of times after he had picked up the regimental Irish flag and attempted to exhort his comrades to advance. He was only one of the victims of the momentous and costly battle in which the Union stopped Robert E. Lee’s Army of Northern Virginia in its first attempt to invade the North.\footnote{Ted Alexander, The Battle of Antietam: The Bloodiest Day, (Charleston, 2011); James V. Murfin, The Gleam of Bayonets: The Battle of Antietam and Robert E. Lee’s Maryland Campaign, September 1862, (Baton Rouge, 2004); James M. McPherson, Crossroads of Freedom: Antietam, (New York, 2002)} The battle also allowed President Abraham Lincoln the impetus he needed to issue the preliminary version of his Emancipation Proclamation, which freed black slaves in the rebel states of the Confederacy, but was destined to antagonise Irish soldiers.\footnote{See especially Allen C. Guelzo, Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation: The End of Slavery in America, (New York, 2004); Burrus M. Carnahan, Act of Justice: Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation and the Law of War, (Lexington, 2007); Louis P. Masur, Lincoln’s Hundred Days: The Emancipation Proclamation and the War for the Union, (Cambridge & London, 2012); William A. Blair & Karen Fisher Younger (eds.), Lincoln’s Proclamation: Emancipation Reconsidered, (Chapel Hill, 2009); Michael Vorenberg, The Emancipation Proclamation: A Brief History with Documents, (New York, 2010)}

In May 1863, an Irish soldier who saw action in only one theatre of war, Felix Brannigan, performed so heroically that he won the Congressional Medal of Honour at Chancellorsville.\footnote{On the Battle of Chancellorsville, see Stephen W. Sears, Chancellorsville, (New York, 1996); Gary W. Gallagher (ed.), Chancellorsville: The Battle and Its Aftermath, (Chapel Hill, 1996): Christian B. Keller, Chancellorsville and the Germans: Nativism, Ethnicity, and Civil War Memory, (New York, 2007)} Not all Irishmen, however, proved as keen to fight and...
die for their adopted home. At the beginning of 1861, the standing army of the United States had numbered only 16,000 officers and men, and roughly one third of these officers resigned and joined the Confederacy on the outbreak of hostilities. In the initial wave of patriotism that accompanied the onset of war, Union recruits were relatively easy to find. As time went on, however, and the casualties increased, it became increasingly difficult for recruitment officers to fill their quotas. To counter this, in the first months of 1863, Congress ‘passed the Enrollment Act, setting up machinery for a federal draft’, thus taking responsibility for recruiting out of the hands of the state governors.\(^8^0\) Able-bodied males between twenty and forty-five were eligible, with the names selected by means of a public lottery on a pre-arranged draft day. Those who could afford it were able to avoid the draft by means of a payment of $300 or on production of a substitute. The act clearly discriminated against the poorest people in society, and the recently arrived Irish fell into that category. They objected loudly and angrily, and nowhere was this rebelliousness felt more than in New York. What should have been a time of celebration for the Union after its most significant victory at the Battle of Gettysburg\(^8^1\) developed instead into a tragedy in the nation’s biggest city. The New York City Draft Riots of July 1863 lasted four days, and the rampaging mob was overwhelmingly Irish in composition. There were at least 100 people killed, mainly African Americans and Irish. The former were seen by many of the mob as the reason for the war and the unpopular draft.\(^8^2\)

Many Americans viewed events such as the Draft Riots as proof of Irish disloyalty to the country that had taken them in. This was despite the fact that Irishmen were still risking their lives in the Union Army. It was true, however, that Irish enthusiasm for the Union cause was waning by 1863. For many Union Irish soldiers, the focus was turning towards a potential war of independence from British

---

rule in Ireland. This occurred for a number of reasons, including the high casualty rates and the changing war aims, which threatened to place freed African Americans in a position to compete with the Irish for work. Other Irish, however, continued to fight and to risk their lives for the Union. Papal Battalion veteran Joseph O’Keeffe was one of these, killed in action at Five Forks, Virginia, in April 1864. The majority of the individuals at the heart of this study, however, were lucky enough to survive the Civil War, albeit in some instances with serious injuries, as was the case with John Mulhall, who was severely wounded at Hatcher’s Run, Virginia, in 1865. Many of those Irish and Irish Americans who had lived through the conflict then focused their attention on Ireland and its needs as part of their ongoing unofficial campaign for Irish nationhood.

**Ireland in 1867**

During the American Civil War, Peter Welsh gave a good insight into the hopes of the Union Irish soldiers for rebellion in Ireland following the conclusion of the war in America. In the eyes of Welsh, ‘America is Ireland’s refuge, Ireland’s last hope, destroy this republic and her hopes are blasted. If Ireland is ever free, the means to accomplish it must come from the shores of America’. This belief was shared by many Irish soldiers in the Union, and a significant number of them returned to Ireland following the Civil War to prepare for a future rebellion. Prior to this, the most recent attempted revolt in Ireland, led by the Young Ireland movement in 1848, had been a failure, consisting as it did of a minor skirmish in County Tipperary. Despite its failure, the 1848 rebellion had helped to convert many Irish people to the necessity of using violence to gain independence. Future Fenian John Devoy was one of those who felt that ‘anything short of [revolution] will never make Ireland free’. The IRB (Fenians), formed in 1858, incorporated this violent

---

84 Peter Welsh to Patrick Prendergast, Camp near Falmouth, Virginia, June 1, 1863, *Peter Welsh Papers*, NYHS
methodology into their ethos. The changing attitude towards violent Irish nationalism was also apparent in the actions of Irishmen as soldiers in both Italy and America during the 1860s, and in their wish to return to Ireland after 1865 to join the Fenian movement as trained soldiers, assisting in the potential achievement of an independent Irish nationhood.87

John O’Leary, a leading member of the IRB, viewed the Fenian movement as a natural progression from the Young Irelanders of the 1840s.88 He and others believed that Irish nationalism needed to advocate a non-sectarian ideology, yet as they required the support of the majority of the Irish people, many of whom were strongly anti-British and anti-Protestant, the IRB were forced to promulgate a more or less Catholic philosophy.89 This suited the majority of the members, who were Catholics themselves, despite the fact that Fenianism was not an officially Catholic movement and was not professedly influenced by the Church in any way. In fact, the movement was opposed by Paul Cullen and the Catholic hierarchy in Ireland.90 The foundation of this Irish nationalist movement, however, highlighted the combination of Catholic religion and anti-Britishness, two of the major themes motivating Irish soldiers in both Italy and America.

In A Union Forever (2013), David Sim has highlighted the fact that there are very few studies that assess Irish nationalism and its connections with the American Union in the nineteenth-century.91 This interconnectedness was apparent in the

89 For more on Fenianism and the Catholic Church, see especially Norman, The Catholic Church and Ireland in the Age of Rebellion, 1859-1873, pp. 86-134; Oliver P. Rafferty, The Church, the State, and the Fenian Threat, 1861-75, (Basingstoke & New York, 1999); Rafferty, The Catholic Church and the Protestant State, pp. 159-176
90 Reilly, ‘Modern Ireland: An Introductory Survey’, p. 96
91 Sim, A Union Forever, pp. 1-10
desire of Union Irish soldiers to put their military training at the service of Ireland in any future rebellion against Britain that would follow the Civil War. As I discuss later in this study, the Irish soldiers wrote on numerous occasions of their hostility towards Britain and their concomitant wish to secure Irish independence. Many hoped that the reunited USA would assist this Irish quest by providing military support in return for Irish service in the Union Army. Therefore, when an Irish rebellion occurred in March 1867 led by the IRB, it included a number of Irish veterans of the Civil War. Many of those in the Fenian leadership had served in the Union army; one of them was John Hasset Gleeson, himself also a former soldier in the Papal Battalion in Italy. The rising ultimately consisted of a number of isolated skirmishes that were quickly and ruthlessly suppressed. Despite the short-lived nature of this failed rebellion though, its significance lies in the fact that the Irish Republican Brotherhood was the first Irish nationalist movement to fully utilise the existing support of the Irish-American community, both ideologically and militarily.

Some of the Irishmen who had fought for the Union Army during the American Civil War saw a chance to strike at the British without returning to Ireland. There was much tension in the relationship between Britain and the USA following the war, due to the former’s unofficial support for the Confederacy. British fear that the United States may attempt to weaken their control of Canada and take their possessions there for themselves led them to strengthen defences on the border between the United States and Canada. The Fenians hoped to stoke these British fears and even incite war between the two countries. They planned to invade Canada, take control of certain areas, and then ransom these back to the British in return for the independence of Ireland. The Fenians believed that even if the British refused and instead sent a force to Canada to defeat them, then this would inevitably lead to

---

93 For more on how the earlier Irish rising in 1848 had helped to create a surge of interest in Irish politics amongst Irish Americans, see Timothy Mason Roberts, Distant Revolutions: 1848 and the Challenge to American Exceptionalism, (Charlottesville, 2009), pp. 26-27; Sim, A Union Forever, pp. 69-96; R.V. Comerford, ‘Churchmen, tenants, and independent opposition, 1850-56’, p. 412; Comerford, The Fenians in Context, pp. 11-23. This link between Ireland and the United States was highlighted again more than a decade later when thousands of young Irishmen enlisted in the Union Army in the American Civil War.
war with the USA.\textsuperscript{94} The Fenians began raiding into Canada in the summer of 1866, and did so again in 1870 and 1871, though with little success.\textsuperscript{95}

In Britain, there was a contemporary opinion that the American Civil War had acted as a dehumanising agent for the Irishmen who had served in it and later become Fenians. This theory, as propagated by the \textit{Star} newspaper, asserted that ‘the bloody excesses of the war worked to demoralise the Fenian leaders and made them immune to pleas for sympathy’. This claim followed the Clerkenwell explosion in London in December 1867, the first bombing carried out by Irishmen on British soil. A small group of Fenians attempted to blow a hole in a prison wall to aid the escape of two comrades, but instead the explosion resulted in the deaths of six people, numerous injuries and extensive damage to property. The participation of apparently inhumane and murderous Irish veterans of the Civil War in the Fenian movement was considered one of the major reasons for the scale of the atrocity. Earlier in the year, further evidence of this apparent inhumanity had been provided when a prison van had been attacked in Manchester in the hope of rescuing other imprisoned Fenians, resulting in the death of a police sergeant.\textsuperscript{96} Outrage in Britain predictably led to escalating levels of prejudice against ordinary Irish migrants. Events such as those in Manchester and London, together with the failed 1867 Irish rebellion, further poisoned relations between the Irish and British, which were already damaged due to their opposing positions during events in Italy and America in the previous years. They also removed any sympathy in Britain for Ireland and the Irish, and precipitated the emergence of ‘a new breed of potential Irish terrorists’.\textsuperscript{97}

\textbf{Conclusion}

Between 1860 and 1865, Irish soldiers gained military experience as participants in the movement for Italian unification and the American Civil War – an

\textsuperscript{94} Devoy, \textit{Recollections of an Irish Rebel}, p. 265
\textsuperscript{95} Bruce, \textit{The Harp and the Eagle}, pp. 238-244; Roy Foster, \textit{Modern Ireland 1600-1972}, (London, 1989), pp. 392-393
\textsuperscript{96} For further information on this event, see Joseph O’Neill, \textit{The Manchester Martyrs}, (Cork, 2012); Paul Rose, \textit{The Manchester Martyrs: The Story of a Fenian Tragedy}, (London, 1970). See also Curtis, \textit{The Cause of Ireland}, pp. 72-83; Rafferty, \textit{The Church, the State, and the Fenian Threat, 1861-75}, pp. 99-105; Bew, \textit{Ireland}, pp. 244-278
experience which a number of them later utilised in rebellion in Ireland. Growing up in 1850s Ireland, these young Irishmen had been influenced by a pervasive Irish Catholic nationalism imbued with antagonism towards Britain, further intensifying the sectarian divisions between Catholics and Protestants. This increasing sense of Irish Catholic nationalism inspired the Irish soldiers’ attempts to preserve the Papal States in Italy in 1860. Whilst in Italy, many young Irishmen had their first encounters with other ethnic groups, in this case Piedmontese soldiers and Papal State residents. Notwithstanding shared Catholic faith, there was mostly animosity between the Irish and the Italians due to the complex circumstances of Italian national unification. Ethnic prejudice would play a more significant role among the Irish soldiers in the Union, especially in the interactions between the Irish and the African Americans. Despite the defeat of their cause on the Italian peninsula, those Irish soldiers who enlisted in the Union army from 1861 retained a sense of both faith and fatherland, reinforced by the growing importance of the Catholic Church in America. They also exhibited increasing levels of Irish Catholic nationalism, which suited the emerging Fenian Brotherhood, as enthusiasm for the Union cause lessened and a desire for Irish independence increased among Irish soldiers from late 1862 and early 1863. In the next chapter, I assess the experiences of some Irish soldiers who served in both Italy and America in relation to topics such as Irish nationalism and migration, Irish attitudes to Giuseppe Garibaldi, and the ways in which the 1867 rebellion was influenced by both the Italian Risorgimento and the American Civil War.

CHAPTER TWO

Transnational Links between Ireland, Italy, and America, 1860-1867

In this chapter, I examine relatively unknown and under-researched connections between Ireland, Italy, and America in the middle of the nineteenth-century. I structure these around the transnational lives of those Irishmen who served as soldiers in the latter two regions, by fighting in both the Italian Risorgimento and in the American Civil War. All these soldiers were Irish born and left Ireland to fight on foreign soil, serving first in Italy in 1860, and following this, in the Union Army in 1861-65. None of these soldiers returned permanently to the land of their birth, instead living out their lives and being buried in their adopted North American home. The life experiences of these Irishmen - Myles Keogh, Patrick Clooney, Daniel Keily, John Coppinger, Joseph O’Keeffe, John Gleeson, Michael Luther, Michael Smith, and John Mulhall – are revealing particularly with regard to transnational connections linking nineteenth-century events such as the Risorgimento and the Civil War. In this chapter, therefore, I aim to connect the nineteenth-century histories of Ireland, Italy, and America through a transnational approach, which emphasises the wider historical significance of the soldiers’ lives, while assessing their contribution to the creation of an incipient Irish nation.


As Akira Iriye and Rana Mitter have written in the foreword to their edited collection *Transnational Lives* (2010), ‘the study of transnational history must be solidly grounded on specific individuals, their ideas, activities, and the organisations they create’. Furthermore, transnational lives ‘cannot be understood merely in the traditional framework of national history […] the lives of these men and women were interconnected in that they were part of the larger story’. This is essentially the approach I take in this chapter. Through an analysis of the letters and other writings of these specific Irish soldiers, I aim to achieve a deeper understanding of transnational themes such as Irish Catholic nationalism, the use of Catholicism for career advancement, the service of Irish soldiers in foreign armies, Irish views on Italian nationalist Giuseppe Garibaldi, and the transatlantic nature of the 1867 Fenian revolt. The lives and experiences of these Irish soldiers are ‘a powerful example of a history that moves between local, national, and larger transnational contexts’. In fact, the paths followed by these men highlight the fact that Ireland was not an isolated entity at the time, but was actually part of the wider nineteenth-century world, in which nationalism and nation-building were pervasive in many parts of the globe.

Illustrative of Ireland’s interconnectedness with the wider world was a meeting held at the City Hall in Brooklyn in May 1861. The aim of this gathering was to form an Irish Brigade of Long Island to serve the Union Army in the American Civil War. The meeting highlighted how the service of the Papal Battalion

---

4 Methodologically, it is not necessary to use all of the men to illuminate each specific transnational link, but only those examples that I deem necessary each time. This allows each connection to be explained and elaborated on without irrelevant and unnecessary biographical details.
of St Patrick the previous year had transnationally influenced events in America. At this meeting, a Captain Hogan

‘referred to the recent Irish Brigade in Italy, and stated that the defence of Spoleto, by Major O’Reilly and his brave little band of seventy men, who held out for several days against 14,000 Piedmontese troops, had no parallel in history for bravery – and that if they had had a few more Irishmen at Fort Sumter the enemy would never have taken it’. ⁸

In other words, Hogan believed that the Irish soldiers were the bravest and most dedicated available to any nation, and therefore the Union could and would be served well by their enlistment. Hogan’s hyperbolic statement provides evidence of the mid-nineteenth century connections between Ireland, Italy, and America. The events of 1860 in Italy had not only made an impact in Ireland, but also across the Atlantic. In many ways, events in the three countries all influenced each other throughout the 1860s, and this is apparent in the fact that Irishmen were willing to fight, and possibly die, in all three, between 1860 and 1867.

The men at the heart of this chapter were ultimately Irish immigrants to America. Yet, they did not arrive relatively impoverished and unskilled as many Irish Catholic immigrants had done in the recent past.⁹ They made a conscious decision to travel firstly to Italy to serve the Pope, for both cultural and religious motives. They then made a similar choice to leave Italy, and cross the Atlantic to serve the Union army in the American Civil War. Their belief in their ability as military men was enhanced by their education and contacts in the upper reaches of the Catholic Church hierarchy in Ireland, Italy, and America, which was also revealing of their higher social status in comparison to many Irish migrants. The involvement of these Irish soldiers in the creation, or attempted creation, of ethnically Irish and Catholic units or brigades which could fight in Ireland in future,

---

is proof that they assisted in the development of an image of Irish nationhood abroad. Though they may have been unaware of the fact, they were unofficial representatives of their country in the international arena.

The first section of this chapter examines how the Irish soldiers’ military service in Italy and in the Union in the 1860s furthers our knowledge of the Irish in foreign armies. Section two outlines the decisive role of Irish Catholic nationalism in these soldiers’ lives, which had originally inspired them to fight for the Papal Army in Italy, and they carried this with them as part of their identity in America. The chapter, then, addresses the phenomenon whereby some Irish soldiers were willing to take advantage of their Irish Catholic nationalism through their connections in the upper echelons of the Catholic Church hierarchy to gain a desired post in the military, and how the spectre of Italian hero, and perceived anti-Catholic, Giuseppe Garibaldi, followed the Irish soldiers across the Atlantic after their experiences in Italy in 1860. At one point during the American Civil War, they faced serving under the leadership of their hated enemy as Lincoln hoped to recruit Garibaldi for the Union army. A further transnational connection highlights how, alongside Irish Catholic nationalism, a parallel resentment of Britain was prominent in the minds of Irish soldiers in both Italy and the Union, and was therefore vital for the growth and development of the Fenian movement. One of the men at the heart of this chapter, John Gleeson, even used his service in foreign armies to train for a future war to secure Irish independence, as did many other veterans of the Civil War. Some of the men, however, continued to serve the US Army in other conflicts, including the Indian Wars of the 1870s and the Spanish-American War of 1898. Ultimately, the examination of these specific transnational links shows how the connections fostered by these Irish soldiers helped not only to generate a sense of an unofficial Irish nation or ‘imagined community’ amongst those they encountered outside of Ireland, but also strengthened the Irishmen’s own sense of Irish Catholic nationalism in a military context.

10 Eric Hobsbawm termed this ‘popular proto-nationalism’, adding that ‘in Europe, only the nationalist Irish, who have no neighbours other than Protestants, are exclusively defined by their religion’. See Hobsbawm, _Nations and Nationalism since 1780_, pp. 46-79. See also Anderson, _Imagined Communities_; Hobsbawm & Ranger (eds.), _The Invention of Tradition_.

Irish service in foreign armies

Mulhall, Keogh, and their comrades were part of an Irish tradition of serving in armies outside their homeland. Since the seventeenth-century, Irishmen had been fighting outside Ireland in the service of armies from Spain, France and Austria, to name but a few.\textsuperscript{12} Many, including three of the men at the heart of this chapter, had also enlisted in the British Army prior to 1860.\textsuperscript{13} Across the Atlantic, Irishmen had served under George Washington in the American War of Independence,\textsuperscript{14} while others later fought for independence movements in South America.\textsuperscript{15} Therefore, the contribution of Irish military men to armies in Europe and North America had become a relatively common occurrence in Irish life by the mid-nineteenth century, and Irish soldiers were generally held in high esteem in foreign armies. In response to British attacks on the reputations and motivations of the Papal Battalion Irishmen who served in Italy in 1860, some Irish soldiers and commentators highlighted this long tradition of fighting abroad.\textsuperscript{16} Writing to Archbishop Paul Cullen from Italy,
A.J. Abraham claimed that it was a natural desire for all Irishmen to prove their prowess in battle.\footnote{A.J. Abraham, ‘Diary and Reminiscences of the Invasion of the Papal States by the Sardian (sic) Army and the Capitulation of Spoleto in 1860’, Irish Papal Brigade Reports, 274/12, Part I, No. 7, \textit{Cullen Papers}, DDA}

The men in this chapter fit this profile, as they were Irish soldiers serving the armies of other countries. Following the brief Italian conflict of September 1860, Papal Battalion veteran and future Union Army soldier Joseph O’Keeffe was described to Rector Tobias Kirby as ‘one of the officers of the Irish Brigade who is at present in Rome and who is no doubt already known to you desirous of holding a respectable and permanent position in the service of his Holiness’.\footnote{Daniel Murphy to Tobias Kirby, Cork, 1 December 1860, \textit{The Kirby Collection}, KIR/1836-1861/2834, PICR} O’Keeffe was similar to many of his peers at this time in his desire to remain in military service in Italy, rather than returning to Ireland permanently or crossing the Atlantic to America, even though he eventually did the latter. Myles Keogh and Daniel Keily also remained in Italy at this time and served in the Company of St Patrick, before travelling to America in 1862. Among the Irish soldiers who had served in the British Army before leaving for Italy was Papal Battalion and Union Army soldier Michael Luther, who had enlisted in the Waterford Regiment of Artillery in the late 1850s. According to his father, the younger Luther served this unit ‘up to May 1860 […] He then offered his services to his Holiness the Pope, for the defence of his States […] under Major O’Reilly in the Irish Papal Brigade, in which he served with distinction’. John Luther went on to say that ‘my son, having expressed a desire to enter the regular service of the U. States […] proceeded to New York in the beginning of August’. Luther enlisted with the 165\textsuperscript{th} Regiment of the New York Infantry on arrival in the United States in 1862.\footnote{John Luther to John Hughes, Youghal, September 20, 1862, \textit{Archbishop John Hughes Papers}, Collection No. 002, Box No. 003, AANY}

Whilst still based in Italy and a Commander of the Company of St Patrick, Papal Battalion veteran Daniel Keily wrote to Union Irish leader Thomas Francis Meagher\footnote{Robert G. Athearn, \textit{Thomas Francis Meagher: An Irish Revolutionary in America}, (New York, 1976); Daniel M. Callaghan, \textit{Thomas Francis Meagher and the Irish Brigade in the Civil War}, (Jefferson, 2006); John M. Hearne & Rory T. Cornish, \textit{Thomas Francis Meagher: The Making of an Irish-American}, (Dublin & Portland, 2006)} in November 1861 to express his support for the causes of both the Union
and Ireland. In a letter written from Grottaferrata outside Rome, and reprinted in the Boston based newspaper *The Pilot*, Keily stated that

‘we take the opportunity of congratulating you and our brave fellows for the active part you and they are taking to uphold the majesty and independence of the Stars and Stripes, which has ever thrown its protecting folds over the expatriated sons of Ireland. They owe it their best allegiance, and we say with our whole hearts all honour, and wish success to the men who fight under it’.

After proclaiming his loyalty to the Union, therefore, Keily showed that he had no residual loyalty to Britain, despite his official status as a British subject and having previously served in the British navy. He stated that he believed that it was the aim of Britain, which he termed the enemy of the Irish race, to see the American flag trampled into the ground, but that it would never happen as long as there were Irish soldiers willing to fight and die to preserve it.\(^{21}\) As well as highlighting Irish hatred and suspicion of Britain, this letter also provides an insight into the transnational links between Ireland, Italy, and America. Despite still being based in Italy, men such as Keily were aware of events across the Atlantic, and were desirous of becoming involved in the American Civil War, which they considered a very important conflict, not only for America but also for the Irish who had sought sanctuary there. In a more general sense, these Irish soldiers wished to continue to represent Ireland in foreign armies and enjoy long military careers, especially if they could avoid serving in the British Army.

Once in America, the Irishmen who had fought in Italy in 1860 and then enlisted in the Union Army immediately set out to prove their loyalty to their adopted home. In July 1862, Patrick Clooney wrote the obituary for a recently deceased colleague. Clooney, who himself died in battle only a few months later, paid tribute to Captain Joseph O’Donoghue, who had decided ‘to stake his life and risk his fortunes with the organisation which Thomas Francis Meagher, at the call of the President, had startled into life [the Irish Brigade], and built up as a monument of the fidelity of the Irish race to the cause of the American Republic’. According to

\(^{21}\) Daniel Keily to Thomas Francis Meagher, Grottaferrata, November 26, 1861, reprinted in *The Pilot*, February 8, 1862, Vol. 25, p. 4, Microfilm M4B665, Roll 017, BPL.
Clooney, O’Donoghue ‘had plunged himself, sword in hand, against [the Union’s] foes, to rescue it from the wreck and ruin which threatened it, nobly laying down his heart’s best blood in its sacred defence’. This letter tells us a great deal about Clooney, who, similarly to his fellow Irishman O’Donoghue, had joined the fight to enhance the Irish reputation in America and to defend the Union, and was therefore, one of ‘those who found a home beneath the flag for which this young hero perished’.\(^{22}\) As they had done in Italy, Clooney and his comrades believed that they represented their country abroad by epitomising Irish patriotism and bravery in battle, which many Irish soldiers saw in sharp contrast with the perceived cowardice of Americans and other ethnicities. They viewed themselves, in essence, as a de facto Irish Catholic national army in Italy and the Union, long before an actual one officially existed, as well as being ambassadors for a burgeoning, though as yet unofficial, Irish nation abroad.

Tellingly, Patrick Clooney’s local churchyard in Waterford in 1863 was the location of the first memorial to a soldier of the Irish Brigade of the Union Army erected outside of the United States. This was done in remembrance of Clooney, following his death at the Battle of Antietam in September 1862.\(^{23}\) In his obituary, Clooney was described as a man who was ‘as brave a soldier, as faithful a friend, and as true-hearted and patriotic an Irishman as ever crossed the Atlantic’. The author of the obituary added that, when the flag of the United States was threatened by Confederate secession from the Union, ‘beneath whose glorious folds so many of his countrymen had sought and found a refuge from English oppression […] he left the land of his birth and heart’s hope to seal with his noble Celtic blood his devotion to it and the Constitution of the American Republic’.\(^{24}\) Clooney’s death, therefore, symbolised the dual loyalties of many Irish soldiers in the Union army, as he fell wearing the blue Union uniform and wrapped in a green Irish battalion flag.\(^{25}\) For


\(^{25}\) David T. Gleeson has examined a similar phenomenon of divided loyalties for the Confederate Irish. See David T. Gleeson, *The Green and the Gray: The Irish in the Confederate States of America*, (Chapel Hill, NC, 2013), pp. 1-9 & 221-224
many Union Irish soldiers, loyalty to America was inextricably linked with the desire to assist Ireland in any fight for independence from Britain, as they believed that a re-United States would assist the Irish claim to self-government. And, as the Civil War progressed, the cause of Ireland and potential Irish nationhood took precedence for many Union Irish soldiers, as they became more and more disillusioned with the reasons to fight in America. Their version of Irish nationalism was, however, always inextricably linked to the Catholic religion.

**Irish Catholic nationalism**

Irish Catholic nationalism was the most important reason why Irishmen such as John Coppinger and his comrades left Ireland to join the Papal Battalion in 1860, yet it was not the only reason. Faith did not rule out other motivations. The aid that had been given by Pope Pius IX to the starving Irish during the Great Famine of the 1840s left many of them grateful and feeling that they owed him their lives. The fact that the Irish had a long tradition of fighting on foreign fields was another reason for volunteering, as was anger towards Britain and its support for Italian unification. What ultimately emerges from the Irish soldier’s letters, however, was that Irish Catholic nationalism was the most important factor in the men’s decisions to join the Papal Battalion. Anthony Smith has stated that ‘beneath the imagined identities created by nationalist ideology there are often deeply embedded and very real ethnic and religious roots’. Therefore, it is apparent that the Irish soldiers’ religion and its transnational nature, which crystallised around the issue of the universal cause of the freedom of the Pope, played a major part in their Irish national identity. Irish Catholic nationalism and its international dimension are also very apparent in the writings of Irish soldiers who later crossed the Atlantic to enlist in the Union Army. Catholic religion and Irishness were seamlessly linked and interwoven

---

29 This was not simply for spiritual reasons but also for a political motive, i.e. the protection of the Pope’s temporal sovereignty, and of his political independence
30 Anthony Smith, quoted in Doyle, *Nations Divided*, p. 13
on numerous occasions, as the terms Irish and Catholic were deemed synonymous with each other by many in Ireland and America, though not by all, as many Protestants in both regions considered themselves equally Irish.\textsuperscript{31}

John Coppinger of Midleton, County Cork, was one of the Irishmen who travelled to Italy in 1860 with previous military experience, as he had already been an officer in the Queen’s Warwickshire Militia.\textsuperscript{32} He found himself in a position of authority in the Papal Army, perhaps due to his military knowledge from his service in the British army, or perhaps his level of education. A letter from Papal Battalion chaplain John McDevitt provides information regarding the position and responsibility of Coppinger in Italy following the end of the brief 1860 war. McDevitt wrote that

‘[Count] Cavour sent for Capt. Coppinger to Turin, told him the officers were free to go at their own expense where they liked, and to bring the men too. Coppinger [….] went to Sir James Hudson, Eng. Ambassador at Turin, and he said they would have nothing to do with the Irish’.\textsuperscript{33}

As the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia, Cavour was the arch-enemy of the Papacy, and the prime mover behind the unification of Italy in 1860.\textsuperscript{34} The fact that Coppinger was considered important enough to be sent to meet Cavour to negotiate the release of Papal soldiers highlights Coppinger’s authority and position of importance in the Papal Army. Thus, despite their military defeat, the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[32] Similarly to John Coppinger, two of the other Irishmen had previously served in the British military forces. Daniel Keily had been a midshipman in the British Navy prior to 1860, while John Mulhall ran off to join the British Army when he was eighteen - ending up in an British Lancer Regiment - and eventually was forcibly brought home by his uncle. See Berkeley, \textit{The Irish Battalion in the Papal Army of 1860}, pp. 230-232
\item[33] John McDevitt to Tobias Kirby, Hotel Royal, Genoa, 12 October 1860, \textit{The Kirby Collection}, KIR/1836-1861/2783, PICR. There is a contradiction in the Irishman’s behaviour, as Coppinger was willing to request assistance from the British Ambassador in returning the men to Ireland, whilst denying their status as British subjects, as did most of the Irishmen who fought in Italy. The same can be said for the British ambassador who, despite not supporting the cause of the Irish soldiers, denied the Irish soldiers the inherent rights of British subjects,
\end{footnotes}
Irish soldiers of the Papal Battalion viewed one of their own as an important diplomatic intermediary between the Piedmontese Prime Minister and the Papal Army. Coppinger was an international representative of both his creed and his country in negotiations with a foreign power, and this implies a notion of the existence of Irish nationhood in his mind and amongst those on whose behalf he spoke. Actions such as these emphasise the importance of Irish Catholic nationalism for the Irish soldiers, as they did not appear to have considered themselves British subjects, but exclusively Catholics and Irishmen.  

Coppinger left the Papal Army in 1861, and travelled to America to enlist in the Union Army. Archbishop of New York John Hughes, one of the most powerful Irish Catholic figures in America, wrote to Secretary of State William H. Seward in September 1861, recommending Coppinger for the Union Army, as the fact ‘that he is a brave and experienced officer is unquestionable. He served five years in the British Army and through the campaign in Italy under the Papal Government’. Archbishop Hughes continued his campaign in support of the Corkman, as he also wrote to the Secretary of War Simon Cameron in October to recommend Coppinger. Hughes described the recent appointment of Coppinger as a Captain in the Union Army by saying that the latter ‘has made no mistake in the appointment. The country does not, at this moment, require in her service either cowards or bounties. Coppinger is neither’. Thus, Coppinger had been personally selected by Hughes for appointment to the Union Army, and the latter had allowed this ‘as partial recognition of the archbishop’s efforts in stimulating loyalty among the Catholic population of his diocese’. Hughes’ letters highlight both Coppinger’s all-encompassing sense of Irish Catholic national identity, as well as the influence the Archbishop and the Roman Catholic Church had on the highest echelons of American politics.

35 O’Carroll, ‘The Papal Brigade of Saint Patrick’, pp. 167-187; O’Carroll, ‘The Irish Papal Brigade’, pp. 73-95
36 John Hughes to William H. Seward, September 29, 1861, Archbishop John Hughes Papers, Collection No. 002, Box No. 002, AANY
37 John Hughes to Simon Cameron, October 02, 1861, Archbishop John Hughes Papers, Collection No. 002, Box No. 001, AANY
inform him of the entry of the former Papal Battalion soldier into the Union Army, delineating the interconnectedness between the lives of the Irish soldiers and the most important men in the Catholic Church in Ireland and America. These were links that former Papal Battalion soldiers were not slow to exploit in their desire for future military employment.

A powerful sense of Irish Catholic nationalism remained apparent throughout the subsequent military career of John Coppinger. In August 1862, he contacted Archbishop Hughes regarding the raising of an Irish Brigade in the Union Army. In this letter, Coppinger leads the reader to surmise that he believed that this Irish Brigade would one day see action in the service of Pope Pius IX, once hostilities had concluded in America. In other words, he hoped to transfer his Irish Brigade to Italy to aid in the defence of the remnants of the Papal States against the forces of Italian unification, and thereby support once more the spiritual leader of his faith. This, certainly, highlights the important role that Irish Catholic nationalism continued to play in his life. An 1863 letter to Tobias Kirby, Rector of the Irish College in Rome, provides further evidence of Coppinger’s ongoing devotion to his Catholic faith. The parish priest of Midleton, Fr John Fitzpatrick, asked Kirby ‘does the Holy Father want any Irish Soldiers or Officers? I have been asked the question by an experienced and distinguished officer, who served in the Papal Irish Brigade. He is now in America’. While Fitzpatrick did not name the individual concerned, it is almost certain that this was Coppinger, given that he was from Midleton, had served in Italy, and was then an officer in America fighting for the Union. Over two years into the American Civil War, the fact that Coppinger’s focus was primarily on Italy and the Pope, to the extent that he was willing to abandon the Union Army and return to Italy, tells us that he was still motivated primarily by his Irish Catholic nationalism, rather than by any profound sense of loyalty to the Union.

The letters written either by, or about, the other veterans of both the Italian Risorgimento and the American Civil War are also informative on the character and strength of their Irish Catholic nationalism. For example, Joseph O’Keeffe was from

---


41 John Fitzpatrick to Tobias Kirby, Midleton, Cork, 12 May 1863, *The Kirby Collection*, KIR/1863/144, PICR
a staunchly Catholic family, being related to the Bishop of Cork. O’Keeffe was described by one writer as ‘a young man of great promise and highly connected’.42 Another writer desired ‘to introduce Mr Joseph O’Keeffe […] I have formed the highest notions of his honourable principles. He was always ardent in devotion to his Country and his Creed’.43 Another veteran of both conflicts, John Gleeson, proudly described his service in Italy in 1860 with what he termed the ‘Roman army’,44 while Patrick Clooney claimed that ‘by the help of God all we have gone through for Pius the Ninth will yet be told you’. He further explained that ‘we went down as we thought to death [….] only for God was with us’.45 In a January 1861 letter, John Mulhall was described as ‘one of the gallant members of the Irish Papal Brigade, who again starts for Rome to serve the Holy Father’.46 This shows that Mulhall was one of those who regretted returning to Ireland and wished to continue serving Pope Pius IX. Thus, in Mulhall’s eyes also, his Irish Catholic nationalism seems to have been the prime motivating factor rather than simply a desire for a long military career. For all of these men, therefore, the devotion to their Catholic faith becomes very apparent from their writings, and it seems to have never weakened, despite any setbacks that they experienced.

Another veteran of both conflicts, Tipperary-born Michael Smith, was very defensive, in his later years, of the cause for which he had fought, implying that there may have still been ongoing criticism of the Papal Battalion at the end of the nineteenth-century. In the early 1900s, he wrote that ‘I regret to learn at this late date that any reflection should be cast on any of the Papal Brigade who fought for God and right […] I was fighting to defend my faith and to uphold the temporal power of Pope Pius IX’. He describes the Papal Battalion as ‘that noble band of men who fought for their religion and expected no recompense for their services on this side of the grave’.47 Even many years after the events recounted in this study, therefore,

42 C. Murphy to Tobias Kirby, Cork, 12 May 1860, The Kirby Collection, KIR/1836-1861/2604, PICR
43 William Delany to Tobias Kirby, Cork, 22 May 1860, The Kirby Collection, KIR/1836-1861/2624, PICR
45 Patrick F. Clooney, Letters, photographs, notes and drafts, being materials for G. F. Berkeley’s studies of the Irish brigade in the papal service, 1860, MSS13280-13287, NLI
46 O’Conor Don to Tobias Kirby, 17 January 1861, The Kirby Collection, KIR/1836-1861/2879, PICR
47 Michael Smith to F.D. Hackett, Brooklyn, 1912, Letters, photographs, notes and drafts, being materials for G. F. Berkeley’s studies of the Irish brigade in the papal service, 1860, MSS13280-13287, NLI
Smith had no doubts as to the legitimacy of the endeavour in Italy in 1860, and it seems unlikely that any of the other veterans had felt any differently. In turn, these men never shed the Irish Catholic component of their national identities, despite the fact that they lived the majority of their lives in a mainly Anglo-Saxon Protestant republic in the USA. Not even the horrors of war, which they witnessed in both Italy and America, appear to have caused any of them to question their Catholic faith or the righteousness of their causes at any point. There were also, however, more practical and careerist motivations for the prominent display of the Irish soldiers’ Catholic faith.

The Irish soldiers’ use of transnational Catholicism for career advancement

Whilst the Irishmen discussed throughout this chapter were competent soldiers, a constant theme in their military careers seems to have been that important individuals smoothed their paths to positions of authority and responsibility. The Irish soldiers were rarely reluctant to use their contacts in the Catholic hierarchy on both sides of the Atlantic for the purpose of improving their job prospects. In this connection, Daniel Keily’s military career is informative. In May 1862, the Waterford News described the recent departure of Keily from Ireland for America to serve in the Union Army. Reprinted in Boston in The Pilot, the article also emphasised his service in Italy in 1860, stating that, when he had joined the Papal Battalion, Keily ‘received the commission of a lieutenant, and through all the wavering fortunes of that distinguished band of soldiers […] he stood his ground in the ranks he had entered, and with the remnant of that band, held his post outside Rome until a few weeks since’. At this point, the writer stated that Keily’s devotion to the cause of the Papacy, together with his natural abilities as a soldier, had brought him to the notice of influential American citizens. These, then, ‘secured for him in the regular army of the Federal States a captaincy, to undertake which distinguished post he last week sailed from Ireland’. The same article claimed that, ‘previous to his departure from Rome, Capt. Keily was permitted an interview with the Pope, and received from his Holiness a benediction, and an expression of hope for his future

welfare and a career of glory’. Clearly, Daniel Keily was a man with important and influential friends in the Catholic hierarchy, friends he was not afraid to use for his benefit, in similar manner to some of his colleagues. It appears that this was a relatively common aspect of mid-nineteenth century transnational Irish military service, at least for those with ambitions of receiving commissions upon joining an army. Contemporaries of Keily, such as Coppinger and Keogh, also enlisted the support of influential acquaintances to aid their careers. This, however, does not seem to have been a cynical ploy, but instead it was probably more a product of the men’s upbringings, since they mostly hailed from middle class and well-connected families. It is likely, therefore, that these particular Irish soldiers were well acquainted with the importance of having influential allies.

Keily revealed his close links with the Catholic hierarchy in Ireland and in America on his arrival in the US capital in 1862. He carried with him letters of recommendation from his local bishop, ‘who knew that I sacrificed a high position and good prospects to come here’. Having just reached Washington D.C. alongside Myles Keogh, Keily then wrote to Archbishop John Hughes in April 1862 to thank him, as ‘Your Lordship’s letters ensured us a most kind reception from the Secretary of State….we shall endeavour to merit your confidence, and trust in divine providence’. The following year, Keily submitted to Hughes ‘the enclosed letters of General Shields, the Archbishop of Cincinnati, and others, recommending earnestly my promotion for gallant and meritorious conduct since I entered the army of the United States’. He went on to explain how he had been severely wounded at the Battle of Port Republic, in Virginia, in 1862, due to his bravery in the heat of battle: ‘although I was only a subordinate there, [General Shields] placed it on record that had my example and suggestions been followed, the result would have been a brilliant victory for our armies’. Thus, Keily was very forward in both his use of important members of the Catholic hierarchy to advance his career, and in his praise

49 ‘Another Papal Brigadier Joining the Union Army’, The Pilot, May 03, 1862, Vol. 25, p. 4, Microfilm M4B665, Roll 017, BPL
51 Daniel J. Keily to John Hughes, Washington D.C., April 10, 1862, Archbishop John Hughes Papers, Collection No. 002, Box No. 003, AANY
for his own performances on the battlefield - traits he shared with Keogh, Coppinger and many others.

Keily survived the Civil War, though with severe injuries. He had, however, been successful in his quest for professional recognition. In April 1862, Keily was made a captain, and in 1864 he became a colonel. Just before the Civil War came to a conclusion, he was commissioned as brigadier-general in March 1865. His former Papal Battalion comrades were equally well rewarded. Myles Keogh began his service in the Union army as a captain assigned to the staff of James Shields. Keogh eventually reached the rank of major. John Gleeson was a major-general in the Union Army by the end of the American Civil War. Immediately upon arriving in the United States, John Coppinger was appointed a captain in the Union army, while Patrick Clooney died a captain at Antietam in 1862. Therefore, these men usually found themselves in positions of power when they enlisted in the Union army. Their cause was assisted to an extent by the lack of trained and experienced officers in the Union army at the beginning of the Civil War, but often the support of the Catholic hierarchy in Ireland, Italy, and America helped to make officers of many Papal Battalion veterans. The lack of exceptional officers in the Union army, however, also led Lincoln to look further afield for inspirational leaders, such as the famous Italian revolutionary Giuseppe Garibaldi.

Irish attitudes to Giuseppe Garibaldi

Garibaldi was a quixotic figure to many around the world at mid-nineteenth century, having been involved in independence movements in both Europe and South America, which had earned him the sobriquet ‘the hero of two worlds’.\(^\text{54}\) During the summer of 1860, he and his “Thousand” conquered both Sicily and southern Italy, and were poised to invade the Papal States as John Mulhall and his Papal Battalion comrades arrived in Italy. Garibaldi’s exploits earned him the support and adulation of many people in Britain, and the hatred of many Catholics in Ireland, as ‘denigration of Garibaldi became a badge of Irish nationalism’.\(^\text{55}\) On Mulhall’s death in 1903, however, his obituary stated that he had arrived in America, following the conflict in Italy, in the company of Italian volunteers for the Union. If

\(^{54}\) Lucy Riall, *Garibaldi: Invention of a Hero*, (New Haven, 2007)

true, this reveals that Italian-Irish relations may not have always been as poor or as strained as the evidence from the Irish soldiers’ letters shows.\textsuperscript{56} This, certainly provides a striking contrast with the attitudes of Irish soldiers, and the Irish people, to Garibaldi.

British support for the forces of Italian unification angered Irish Catholic nationalists throughout the 1850s, as they were incensed at what they regarded as one standard for Italian affairs but another for Irish matters. The presence of famous Italian exiles and nationalists, such as Giuseppe Mazzini, in London, Liverpool, and other British cities, only increased the pro-Italian, anti-Papal and anti-Irish sentiments in Britain.\textsuperscript{57} In response to this, as early as January 1859, Irish nationalist newspaper \textit{The Nation} put forth its thesis that Italian unification was against the natural order. The only true Italian nation, according to the newspaper, was one that ought to be ruled by ‘the arbiter of Christendom, the oldest dynasty, the most ancient sovereignty, the most national government in Europe – the chair of Peter’.\textsuperscript{58} The same newspaper also reiterated the perceived hypocrisy of Britain, asserting in late 1859 that the British government was unwilling to apply the same principles to Ireland that it vocally propagated for Italy.\textsuperscript{59} The anti-Catholic and anti-Papal sentiments, which abounded especially in the British press, due to traditional aggressive attitudes towards the Papacy, played a part in galvanising the Irish people around the Papal cause, as did the strong British support for Garibaldi.\textsuperscript{60} Garibaldi, therefore, provided a very convenient focus for the discord between Irish Catholics on the side of the Pope, and their opponents who hoped to see Italy united and the Papacy’s temporal power destroyed.\textsuperscript{61}

British newspapers such as \textit{The Times} frequently carried articles and editorials lauding Garibaldi’s bravery, and the British public were eager for news of

\textsuperscript{56} ‘Death List of a Day’, \textit{The New York Times}, July 8, 1903, p. 9, PHN
\textsuperscript{57} Riall, \textit{Garibaldi}, pp. 33-37; Roland Sarti, ‘Giuseppe Mazzini and his opponents’, in Davis (ed.), \textit{Italy in the Nineteenth Century 1796-1900}, pp. 74-107
\textsuperscript{58} ‘Italian Freedom’, \textit{The Nation}, January 15, 1859, p. 9, INA
\textsuperscript{59} ‘Ireland and Italy’, \textit{The Nation}, November 26, 1859, p. 8, INA
\textsuperscript{61} Raponi, \textit{Religion and Politics in the Risorgimento}
his exploits. Garibaldi testimonial funds were set up in various parts of Britain to raise money on the Italian’s behalf during 1860. Garibaldi himself even wrote back from time to time thanking the organisers of these funds, and, on one occasion, requested that they spend the money on ‘muskets with bayonets’ to send to Italy. These efforts to raise money were not always successful, and Catholics in Britain expressed delight when this happened. For example, George Montgomery wrote to Rector Tobias Kirby from England to inform him that ‘you will be glad to hear that the attempt to get up a subscription for Garibaldi here in Wednesbury was a total failure’. In June 1860, when Irishmen such as Keogh, Coppinger and others arrived in Italy to defend the Papal States from potential attack, Garibaldi had just declared himself dictator of Sicily, and The Times described him as ‘the Washington of Italy’. This equation of Garibaldi with one of the most formidable figures in American and world history is informative of the esteem in which he was held in Britain. A small number of British men even travelled to Italy in 1860 to fight on the side of Garibaldi. The support given in Britain to Garibaldi inevitably led to an increase in anti-British feeling amongst both the Irish soldiers in Italy and many Irish Catholics in Ireland, since any cause Britain supported was invariably seen as opposing Ireland.

It was, though, in the Union where the issue of Irish soldiers’ attitudes to Garibaldi became more complicated. Men such as Mulhall, Keogh, and their comrades, having fought for the Papal Army in defiance of both Garibaldi and the Piedmontese, subsequently served the Union Army in the Civil War. President Abraham Lincoln, however, was a fervent admirer of Garibaldi - a feeling reciprocated by the Italian – and, by 1862, he was requesting his assistance in

62 ‘A man like Garibaldi is sure to do something’, The Times, May 18, 1860. Issue 23623, p. 8, TDA; ‘Garibaldi is a hero or a brigand’, The Times, May 22, 1860. Issue 23626, p. 9, TDA
63 ‘To The Editor Of The Times’, The Times, August 14, 1860, Issue 23698, p. 3, TDA
64 George Montgomery to Tobias Kirby, Wednesbury, 29 November 1860, The Kirby Collection, KIR/1836-1861/2732, PICR
defeating the Confederate States. Though Garibaldi eventually turned down the offer of a commission in the Union Army, it is informative to muse on the feelings of Irishmen such as Mulhall and his comrades towards the possibility that a man they likely despised, and whose aims they had vociferously opposed in Italy, somehow might have become their leader. It is possible that, along with many Irish soldiers, they might have reconsidered their service in the Union Army, had they been required to pledge their loyalty to a man who had done more than most to deprive Pope Pius IX of his temporal power. Considering how many Irish soldiers began to doubt the validity of the Union cause following the Emancipation Proclamation, it is also difficult to envisage them willingly following the enemy of their spiritual father.

The following year, though, the man for whom Irish Catholic soldiers such as Mulhall had risked their lives and reputations, Pope Pius IX, extended an unofficial recognition to the Confederacy, the enemy of the Union Irish soldiers. In early 1863, the Confederacy had begun a concerted campaign for diplomatic recognition from the Vatican. Pius IX had been calling for peace since the previous October, and, as Don Doyle has observed, ‘Pius IX chose to counsel peace at a time when peace meant victory for secession’. Garibaldi’s abortive attempt to take Rome in 1862, and the subsequent show of affection for him in Europe and in America, had worried Pius IX, especially as Garibaldi had previously been offered the overall command of the Union Army. In August 1863, Pius IX renewed his call for peace, which was widely publicised on the North American continent. Though official
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recognition of the Confederate States by the Vatican never actually happened, the Pope’s intervention possibly contributed to a lessening commitment to the Union by Catholic Irish soldiers. Given the unyielding dedication of the Irish soldiers to the same Pope in Italy, it is likely that they felt uncomfortable in continuing to fight, and in so doing opposing a stated desire for peace by their spiritual leader. The possibility of being led by their implacable enemy Garibaldi, the man who did much to wrench the Papal States from the Pope’s grasp, also affected their support for the Union at a time when it was already weakened by the changing of Union war aims to support slave emancipation.

Even in 1862, two years after defeat for the Papal forces in Italy, Irish Catholic anger was still directed towards Garibaldi. In the battle of Aspromonte, in southern Italy, in the same year, Garibaldi’s volunteer army was defeated in attempting to move towards the city of Rome. Garibaldi had left the army of the Kingdom of Italy with no choice but to intervene and stop him. This Catholic animosity was further expressed by the Irish in Britain at the time, as Hyde Park in London had been the scene of attacks on supporters of Garibaldi by mainly Irish Catholics in late September 1862. Despite the outcome of events in Italy, therefore, as well as the unofficial recognition given by the Pope to the Confederate States, the faith and belief of Irish Catholics and their hatred of Garibaldi remained for the most part unaffected. For the Irish soldiers, uniting against a common enemy such as Garibaldi also enhanced their sense of being part of an unofficial Irish national army,
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73 'Garibaldi. (From Our Own Correspondent)', The Times, Sept. 4, 1862, Issue 24342, p. 10, TDA
an essential element in the creation of a future Irish nation. The military training that
these men and their contemporaries received in the Union Army would prove
essential for them as members of the Fenian movement in Ireland in 1867.

The 1867 Fenian Rebellion

In Nations Divided (2002), Don Doyle wrote on the international nature of
revolutionary nationalism in the eighteenth-century that ‘ideas that flowed from
Europe to fuel revolution in North America moved back across the Atlantic to ignite
another revolution’. While he was not referring to nineteenth-century Ireland, I
believe that this thesis can also be applied to the transnational context of the 1867
Fenian Rebellion. The Fenian Brotherhood had grown in strength in Civil War
America. In his diaries, Union soldier Thomas Francis Galwey spoke of the Fenian
meetings he attended in the hospital marquee of the Irish Brigade during the Civil
War. Irish American Galwey had been a member of the Fenian Brotherhood since
October 1860, and later became the editor of the Catholic World magazine, again
emphasising the link between Irish nationalism and Catholicism. Galwey was part of
the Potomac Circle of Fenians, and he identified a fellow member of this grouping as
Papal Battalion veteran John Gleeson. One of the meetings that he attended was
addressed by Thomas Francis Meagher, who stated that he hoped he might survive
long enough to lead Irish soldiers in a war against Britain in Ireland. This means,
therefore, that probably the most influential Irishman in the Union Army was openly
a Fenian member, or, at the very least, supportive of the movement. The fact that
Fenian groupings operated relatively openly within the Union army tells us that
many Irish soldiers may already have been focused more on the fight that was to
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come in Ireland than the one in America. It may also have been indicative of a general anti-British sentiment amongst some in the Union army and the wider populace, due at least in part to unofficial British support for the Confederacy.

Another significant and influential Irishman in the Union, Colonel Michael Corcoran, wrote to *The Pilot* in August 1863 to reply to an attack on the Fenian movement, and the loyalty of Irish soldiers, which had previously appeared in the *New York Tablet*. A letter signed by Corcoran and others rebuffed claims that their loyalties to Ireland interfered with other commitments, specifically their service to the Union. They asserted that, in becoming a member of the Fenians, no oath of secrecy was required from any candidate for admission. Instead, one was only required to pledge to work towards Irish independence, once this did not clash with loyalty to the Union. Despite claims such as this, it is apparent that many Irish soldiers in the Civil War were at that point focused more on the country of their birth than on the one that they had adopted. The same letter went on to elaborate on Irishmen’s reasons for joining the Fenians. According to Corcoran, ‘we believe in our simple hearts that it is not a sin to be enemies of that fell English tyranny, which is, and ever has been, the bane of the land of our birth and of our race, and which will continue to be so while it lasts’. All of this they claimed to be in common with what they termed their ‘Fenian Brothers’ throughout America. Irishmen planned to use their Union Army military training, therefore, in the hope of assisting the Fenians in the creation of a separate Irish republic, free from any British influence.

An article in *The Pilot* in September 1865 highlighted the growing transnational impact on Ireland of events in America. The author claimed that, following the end of the Civil War, every ship that arrived in Cork Harbour from New York or Boston ‘lands on these shores large numbers of young men, who have served in the Republican army, all of whom carry on their persons revolver pistols,
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rifled guns, daggers, and short swords, which they openly expose in their perambulations through the city’. The article highlighted the less than discreet nature of these individuals, as it added that the new arrivals were constantly telling all who would listen about plans made by the Fenian Brotherhood in the United States to invade Ireland.83 Furthermore, Irish soldiers did not just come from the USA to support the rebellion. By 1865, of the 26,000 British army troops in Ireland, approximately 8,000 were Fenians, with another 7,000 part of the British military establishment outside Ireland.84 A small number of the Irish soldiers who had fought for the Papal Battalion also became members of the Fenian movement on their return to Ireland.85 All of this highlights a strong, and previously unidentified, transnational connection between the American Civil War and nineteenth-century European nationalist movements.86 Irishmen who had gained military training and experience in Italy and America brought these skills home with them to be put in the service of the Fenians, all in the hope of creating an official and internationally recognised Irish nation-state.

The links between the American Civil War, the Italian Risorgimento, and the Irish rebellion are most apparent in the actions of John Gleeson. He joined the Papal Battalion in 1860 along with three of his brothers. After his service in Italy, he enlisted in the Union army in New York, and by war’s end, Gleeson was a major-general, as well as being very involved with the Fenians. Gleeson and his younger

83 ‘Armed Fenian Emigrants Flocking from America’, The Pilot, September 30, 1865, Vol. 28, p. 1, Microfilm M4B665, Roll 018, BPL. This phenomenon is a minor example of C.A. Bayly’s theory that ‘the most pervasive and long-term effects of the Civil War were registered in the domain of war making itself’. Specifically, Bayly wrote of how the increase in the production of armaments led to American guns and other weaponry making its way into the hands of revolutionaries and anarchists in Europe, Asia, and Africa, often to be used against colonial powers such as the British. This is what occurred in Ireland in 1867, though on a small scale and with minimal success. See Bayly, The Birth of the Modern World 1780-1914, p. 165
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brother Joseph travelled to Ireland after the Civil War, and they were in their hometown of Borrisoleigh, County Tipperary, in 1867 in command of the local Fenian unit. Irish nationalist John Devoy claimed that Gleeson and his brother were among the first of the Irish veterans to return to Ireland in the hope of fighting against the British. By 1868, however, John Gleeson had returned to the United States, following the failure of the Fenian revolt, for which he himself did not actually appear on the day. It appears that Gleeson’s dedication to the Fenian movement and to Ireland may have been fleeting at best. Unsurprisingly, not all the men who had fought in Italy and America were as dedicated as others to the Irish cause.

Gleeson’s life is revealing, however, of the transatlantic connections between the Italian Risorgimento, the American Civil War and an insurrectionary armed group in Europe. This transnational and transatlantic milieu was one of the factors that helped to create the foundational mind-set for a burgeoning Irish Catholic nation.

Most of the men at the heart of this chapter were, however, not active in Ireland in 1867. Some stayed on in the American military, and encountered other ethnic groups – such as Native American and Spanish - after 1865. The story of Myles Keogh emphasises the transnational nature of the military careers of Irish soldiers from 1860 to 1865, but also the fact that a number of them continued to serve the United States through the 1860s, the 1870s, and beyond this. It, thus, highlights that some of these men’s military stories did not end with the conclusion of the Civil War. After the defeat of the Papal Army, every member of the Irish Battalion received a Papal Medal for their services, inscribed with the words Pro Petri Sede [For the Seat of Peter]. Myles Keogh was given a further honour for distinguished service, the decoration of The Order of Saint Gregory the Great. Keogh remained in Rome and joined the Company of St Patrick and later the Papal
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Zouaves, hastily formed to protect the remnants of the Pope’s lands. After leaving this unit, he arrived in New York in April 1862. Keogh was eventually promoted to major, distinguishing himself in several battles in the years that followed, and was fortunate enough to survive the Civil War.91

After 1865, Keogh continued in the service of the US Army, coming under the command of General George Armstrong Custer.92 Keogh was a witness to the Indian Wars that followed, and was also involved in enforcing government policy in Kentucky and South Carolina in the early 1870s in the face of fierce opposition from the Ku Klux Klan. By the mid-1870s, US relations with Native Americans had seriously deteriorated following a series of broken treaties, battles, and skirmishes.93

In June 1876, Keogh found himself alongside Custer in the valley of the Little Bighorn River. Opposing them were a Native American force led by Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse.94 Following the battle, there were no survivors on the US army side, and all bodies were mutilated, apart allegedly from that of Keogh.95 A number of claims have been put forward to explain this. Possibly Keogh’s body was not desecrated because the Native Americans regarded his Papal medals as powerful charms, or it may have been a mark of respect for his courage. Another story claimed that, when Sitting Bull died in 1890, Keogh’s Pro Petri Sede medal was found on his body, since the Sioux chief had taken it from the dead Keogh and worn it since then as a tribute. Whether true or not, these claims highlight the transnational links epitomised by Keogh’s life – namely that an Irishman was a participant in the Italian Risorgimento, in the American Civil War, and in the Indian Wars. His life linked such diverse historical characters as Pope Pius IX, Giuseppe Garibaldi, Abraham Lincoln, George Custer, and Sitting Bull. Thus, his life story epitomises the
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transnational nature of the lives of Irish soldiers and the influence they had on historical events, both in Ireland and internationally, in the second half of the nineteenth-century.

**Conclusion**

By 1860, Irishmen had completed military service for countries including Britain, France, Spain, Austria and the USA, to name but a few. The notion of young Catholic Irishmen leaving home and fighting in foreign armies was relatively common, therefore, when it became necessary to assist their spiritual leader Pius IX. Patrick Clooney and his comrades enlisted in the Papal Battalion in the hope of preventing either the Piedmontese in the north, or Garibaldi’s followers in the south, from violating the borders of the Papal States. They were staggeringly unsuccessful. It could even be argued that Garibaldi’s approximately 1,000 men achieved more and were infinitely more triumphant in their conquest of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies than the Papal Battalion’s 1,300 Irish soldiers who, as part of the larger Papal Army, were easily defeated. The codicil to this claim, though, was that the latter was severely outnumbered by the Piedmontese forces, and, in reality, stood little to no chance of victory. Despite this, the Irish soldiers’ belief in the necessity of representing Ireland abroad in both an ambassadorial and a military sense never wavered, and they were conscious of this responsibility at all times.

Coppinger, Keily and their comrades were only some of the motivated Irishmen with an intense Catholic faith who risked their lives serving foreign leaders during the first half of the 1860s. In the introduction to their edited collection *Transnational Soldiers* (2013), Nir Arielli and Bruce Collins highlighted how volunteering for ideological reasons was a specifically modern phenomenon with no parallel in early modern warfare. Irish national identity’s growing bond with Catholicism, the main reason Irishmen volunteered to fight in 1860, underwent a major test with the experience in Italy, and was further strengthened by dependence on the Catholic Church when they arrived in America. The international context of Irish Catholic nationalism was particularly relevant in Italy, however, due to the significance of the Pope’s temporal power, i.e. his earthly and political influence.97
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As a result, the young Irishmen who volunteered to join the Papal Battalion expressed a strong religious tone in their letters. Many of them spoke of the righteousness of their cause, and rarely, if ever, acknowledged that their opponents may have had equally valid and legitimate aims. Some Irish soldiers professed a desire to be martyrs for the Catholic religion, some spoke of crusades and used the language of a holy war, while many others saw the hand of God in events unfolding before their eyes. However, the Irish soldiers’ inability to fully grasp the implications of their aims, in opposition to the contradictory aspirations of their opponents, left the men of the Papal Battalion open to accusations of hypocrisy.

In this connection, the strength of Irish Catholic nationalism differed depending on the particular individual in question. It is difficult to believe, however, that all Irish soldiers who served in Italy and in America were motivated solely by their religion, at least with regard to its spiritual aspect. Certainly, all were inspired by Catholicism to a certain extent, and, in some instances, they were driven mostly by their combined sense of Irish nationalism and Catholicism. Some, however, while being undoubtedly strongly Catholic, were also motivated by a desire for professional advancement and status. They did not hesitate to use their clerical connections at home and abroad to secure positions of power in both the Papal Battalion and in the Union army. Coppinger, Keily, and their colleagues all fit into this category. While acknowledging their competence as soldiers, as well as their unfailing commitment to their respective causes, they certainly were not shy about putting themselves forward for professional advancement. Some of their letters prove how they were willing to use their clerical connections to enhance and advance their careers. In fact, it appears from many letters to members of the Catholic hierarchy in Ireland, Italy, and America, that some of them could even be described as shameless self-publicists. The careers of Keogh and his comrades, therefore, contradict accusations of anti-Catholicism and discrimination against the Irish in the Union army.98 The men at the heart of this chapter either entered armies at a high level or achieved promotion during wars. The lives and military careers of these men prove that it is not always accurate to say that the Irish in the Union army suffered anti-Catholic and anti-Irish discrimination, though this may have been the case for many soldiers. Class and social standing may have been more of a factor

---

98 Bruce, The Harp and the Eagle, pp. 86-113
than ethnicity in this respect, in that one’s place in society dictated future career prospects.

From a religious point of view, an interesting comparison can be made between the love of the Irish soldiers for Pope Pius IX and the worship of Garibaldi by the thousands who adored him worldwide. Lucy Riall has highlighted how the latter was looked on as a ‘saviour’ by Sicilians when he and his forces landed on the island in 1860. Accordingly, Garibaldi became the subject of an official cult, both before, and especially after his death. Riall points out that this cult was religious in nature, and was deliberately cultivated by Garibaldi himself, through his use of religious language and his participation in religious festivals in Sicily. Much of this resonated with Roman Catholic processions and imagery. Garibaldi was much less antagonistic and aggressive towards Catholicism than Cavour and the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia had been in the 1850s. Some radicalised priests fought with Garibaldi in Sicily, while several even supported the abolition of Papal temporal power. The Garibaldi cult allowed supporters of Italian unification to present it as historically inevitable and his forces as morally superior to the evil opposition of Austria and the Papacy. This was a similar rhetoric to that used by Irish soldiers such as Coppinger, Keily, and others, when they spoke of their enemies, viewing the Irish soldiers in both Italy and America as more virtuous than their heathen adversaries. Papal Battalion and Union Irishmen likewise considered the Piedmontese soldiers and Papal State citizens in Italy, and the Confederate soldiers in America, less noble and gallant than themselves. Garibaldi remained, however, the face of their tormenter, and the enemies of the Pope were described by Irish soldiers en masse as ‘Garibaldians’.

The British, however, also remained regular targets of Irish vitriol. Marta Ramón has written that James Stephens, the founder of the Irish Republican
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Brotherhood, had given a new structure and sense of purpose to Irish-American nationalism when he visited New York in 1858.\textsuperscript{103} Due to its transatlantic nature, the IRB had close links with Irish migrants in the United States, and many Irishmen who fought in the American Civil War later returned to Ireland to fight with the Fenians in the 1867 rebellion.\textsuperscript{104} Irish recruiters during the Civil War, chief amongst them Thomas Francis Meagher and Michael Corcoran, emphasised the link between Irish service for the Union Army and a future war of independence in Ireland. The hope of a role in the liberation of Ireland was a motivational factor for many Irishmen who served the Union, not just those who were members of the Fenian Brotherhood. Many Irish soldiers planned to use the experience they had gained in America in a war to drive the British out of Ireland.\textsuperscript{105} As the war went on, many Irish in America increasingly turned their attentions towards Ireland and away from the Union.\textsuperscript{106} This commitment to Ireland, however, was not without its critics in America, especially as regards Irish loyalty, or more accurately a perceived lack thereof, to their adopted home. Events such as the New York City Draft Riots in July 1863 were seen by many Americans as further proof of this disloyalty, despite the wartime sacrifices made by Irishmen such as Coppinger, Keily, and others.\textsuperscript{107} Ultimately, the Irishmen discussed in this chapter were unique amongst the Irish diaspora from both a military and social point of view. Keogh and his comrades highlight the fact that Irish migration was not exclusively the preserve of the relatively poor starving masses.\textsuperscript{108} Instead, this option could also be of interest to middle-class educated Irishmen who chose to emigrate rather than having no choice in the matter.\textsuperscript{109} These Irishmen arrived in Italy and America relatively well off as
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professional and experienced soldiers, though it is true that many Irish who fought for the Papal Battalion and in both the Union and Confederate armies were impoverished and unskilled.110 The Irishmen at the heart of this chapter either created, or were part of, completely new ethnically Irish regiments in Italy and in America, which could also potentially serve Ireland in the future. One of them utilised his experiences in the Papal Battalion and the Union army as a training ground for the Fenian rebellion of 1867. Within the wider context, they were part of de facto Irish armies abroad, which represented their country in an unofficial capacity before an Irish nation proper existed. Theirs is ultimately a story of military adventure and idealism in the mid-nineteenth century world. In the next chapter, I begin the comparative section of this work, assessing the different roles of the Catholic religion as a motivating factor for other Irish soldiers who served either in Italy or in America, though the conclusions I draw are equally applicable to the men at the centre of this chapter.
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CHAPTER THREE

Irish Soldiers and Catholicism in 1860 Italy and in Civil War America

There were three major reasons that motivated the Papal Battalion and the Union Irish soldiers going to war in Italy in 1860 and America in 1861 to 1865: Catholic religion, rancour towards Britain, and negative Irish attitudes to other ethnicities.¹ In this chapter, I analyse the first of these, Catholicism, through a focus on different Irish soldiers from those whose writings I have utilised in the previous transnational chapter. The Irishmen at the heart of this chapter participated either in the Italian Risorgimento or in the American Civil War, but not in both.² Thus, their writings allow me to assess comparatively the different attitudes towards Catholicism held by Irish Catholic soldiers in Italy and in America and highlight the similarities and differences between these.³ As was the case with the Irish soldiers who served in both countries, these men were part of an imagined Irish nation, as they represented Ireland on the international stage as if it was an independent country, in defiance of its official status as part of the United Kingdom.⁴

This comparative chapter begins by assessing the role of Catholicism among Irish soldiers in Italy in 1860, and then moves on to the Union Irish soldiers during

the American Civil War. On viewing the evidence presented here, a fundamental difference becomes apparent in the role of Irish Catholic nationalism in Italy and in America, primarily as to how it was used to justify the contradiction in the conflicting aims of the two groups of soldiers. The Irish soldiers’ apparent hypocrisy in opposing Italian unity in 1860 while supporting reunification in Civil War America can only be understood with a cognisance of the influence of Catholicism and the Papacy in the soldiers’ minds and lives.5 In the letters of Irish soldiers in the Papal Battalion in 1860, the devotion to the Catholic religion clearly emerges, together with a desire to protect the temporal power of the Papacy. This religious dedication allowed the Irish soldiers to ignore the frequent accusations of duplicitous behaviour made against them from both within Italy, and from Britain, due to their opposition to Italian nationhood. Catholic religion served a different role for Irish soldiers in the Union Army, however. Here, the Irish soldiers were primarily concerned with ensuring that they had adequate spiritual support in place before, during, and after military engagements, and, in some cases, they used their contacts in the Catholic hierarchy to gain commissions and promotions.

In Italy, devout Catholic faith was the main reason Irishmen initially enlisted in the Papal Battalion. Through their actions, Irish soldiers supported an absolutist regime in Italy in the shape of the Papacy against the constitutional monarchy of the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia and its attempt to unite the Italian peninsula. Yet, in the Union army other Irish soldiers desired a democratic and unified republic in America. In other words, Irish soldiers opposed unity in Italy, but enthusiastically endorsed it in America. In fact, the Irish soldiers in the Union Army were part of a movement that opposed the right of the Confederate States to secede from the United States. Instead of attempting to obstruct national unity as their countrymen had done in Italy, Union Irish soldiers desired its maintenance. This glaring contradiction and apparent hypocrisy can only be understood by an appreciation of the fact that, while in Italy, the Catholic faith was the overwhelming reason that motivated Irish soldiers to serve. In America, Catholic religion was an important element of the Irish identity

for Union Irish soldiers, as well as being a source of comfort and succour to them in times of danger. It was almost never used to justify or rationalise their support for the Union, as the Papal Battalion soldiers had used their faith to justify their cause. Though the religious beliefs of Irish soldiers in the Union Army were no less ardent, they were usually put to more practical ends, such as spiritual comfort and the pursuit of career advancement.

**Catholicism and the Papal Battalion of St. Patrick in 1860**

Catholic faith was the prime motivation for many of the Irishmen who enlisted to serve in Italy. From early 1860 on, there were many young men writing from Ireland offering their support as potential soldiers to Tobias Kirby, Rector of the Irish College in Rome. Kirby and the Irish College played a major role in coordinating the Papal Battalion throughout its existence, corresponding with Irishmen in Ireland as they volunteered to serve, channelling the money raised at home to the men in Italy, and generally serving as the focus of Irish support for the Pope. At that time, the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia was involved in the process of unifying northern and central Italy through annexation of the Italian states and regions of Tuscany, Parma, Modena, and Romagna. These events were widely covered in both local and national Irish newspapers, and it is likely that the future Papal soldiers were aware of the situation. The Catholic Church in Ireland campaigned to make the Irish public cognisant of the challenge facing Pope Pius IX in maintaining his temporal power, and had begun raising an army to be known as the Papal Battalion of St Patrick. Irish clergy throughout the country, some more enthusiastically than others, promoted the Papal Battalion and encouraged the young male members of their flocks to join the endeavour. Thus, Irishmen spoke excitedly of their desire to go to Rome to serve their spiritual leader in his time of need. The founder of the *Cork Examiner*, John Francis Maguire, wrote to Kirby in June 1860 to introduce a young Irish man named Adolphus Fitzpatrick, about to leave for Rome to join the Papal Battalion. Fitzpatrick was ‘offering his strong arm and ardent spirit to
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the Service of the Holy Father, and, as a good Catholic, he has made the proper preparation for a mission so honouring to his country and religion’. 9 Denis O’Donovan was similarly filled with enthusiasm for the cause in May 1860, after reading about the arrival of one thousand men in Trieste and Ancona. He wrote to Kirby stating that ‘now I would wish to wield the sword in [Pope Pius IX’s] defence’. 10 These two examples among many emphasise the role of Catholicism in the Irishmen’s decisions to travel to Italy and enlist.

The strength of the bond between Irish national identity and Catholicism, 11 epitomised by the young men who joined the Papal Battalion, was also apparent on their long journey across Europe to reach Italy. Some of the men went to great lengths to make their way to Rome. Many had to acquire their first passports and travel across Europe by land or sea to Italy with little or no support from the Papal Army. In his diary, William Kenny documented his journey from Ireland through Britain and Europe, as well as his early days in Italy, giving an idea of the possible route taken by many Irishmen, along with the spiritual focus of the soldiers as they travelled. Kenny described the towns and countryside he passed through always in terms of his and his fellow Irish soldiers’ Catholic faith. For example, he classified Hull in England as ‘a very bigoted town. There are only a few Roman Catholics in it’. It is probable that much animosity was directed by many locals at any Irishmen travelling in Britain at this time, given the high levels of anti-Catholicism in Victorian Britain. 12 Kenny further expounded on the Catholic churches he visited in Belgium and gave his opinion on the morals and levels of religious devotion of the
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various populations along the way to Italy, up until he arrived at Ancona in the Papal States.13

Once the Irishmen arrived in Italy, they officially enlisted with the Papal Battalion and began their training. Unexpectedly, however, they were not all assigned together in one unit, but instead were divided into companies and sent to different locations, along with representatives of the other nationalities of the Papal Army. While some were disillusioned and returned home at this point, the majority remained, due in large part to their strong Catholic faith and loyalty to the Pope. John McDevitt, of All Hallows College, Dublin, who ‘had the high honour of being in the Pope’s service’ as a chaplain to the Papal Battalion, wrote from Ancona to Rector Tobias Kirby in July 1860, highlighting the positive demeanour of most of the Irishmen and their lack of doubt as to the righteousness of their cause. McDevitt stated that ‘as regards us here, we are (thank God) going on splendidly….not a breath of grumbling or dissatisfaction is to be heard….there is no fear of anything going wrong, because they work for love of God, and his church’.14 At that time, however, Giuseppe Garibaldi and his army were in control of most of the island of Sicily, and preparing to land on the Italian mainland in Calabria.15 It must have seemed to the Irish soldiers, at least those amongst them who were aware of these events, that they faced a potential war on two fronts from the north and the south of the Papal States. Despite this, most Irish soldiers did not waver in their belief in the Pope’s cause.

The soldiers’ strong Catholic faith did not, however, render them incapable of some defiance to their spiritual leaders on occasion, especially if these were not Irish. Papal Battlion soldier Michael Crean recalled an incident during the battle of Spoleto. Despite being overwhelmed numerically and realising that resistance was

14 John McDevitt to Tobias Kirby, Ancona, 25 July 1860, The Kirby Collection, KIR/1836-1861/2709, PICR
futile, Irish Papal leader Myles O’Reilly and his men chose to make a stand. After an artillery bombardment, the Archbishop of Spoleto was sent by the Piedmontese leader General Brignone to the fortress where the Irish soldiers were based to seek a surrender. Though acknowledging the sacred office of the Archbishop and the fact that ‘as a messenger of peace his representation was received with the deepest respect, the suggestion that the Irish should surrender was not accepted. The Archbishop went back and the firing was renewed with increased vigour’. One could speculate on how the Irish would have reacted had the messenger of peace been of the same nationality as they were, even though it seems that such was the strength of their belief in the cause that they would not have surrendered at any point. This incident is an informative example, as it highlights how Irish national pride could on occasion prevail over Catholic religious loyalty, no matter how strongly intertwined the two might have been. Since the soldiers were acutely aware that they represented an unofficial Irish nation outside of Ireland, they were unwilling to do anything that may have caused damage to its reputation, such as surrendering instead of fighting to the death. Actions such as these, thus, show that the Irish soldiers in the Papal Battalion were aware of their role in the process of creating an “imagined” Irish nation in the nineteenth-century, as were their contemporaries in the Union army.  

After the brief conflict of September 1860, the Piedmontese took control of all of the Papal States with the exception of Rome. As previously stated, despite suffering a quick defeat in their attempts to preserve the Papal States for Pope Pius IX, the Irishmen of the Papal Battalion who chose to return to Ireland immediately were welcomed home as Catholic heroes. John McDevitt wrote to Rector Kirby in November 1860 describing the reception afforded to the men on their return to Ireland, and the subsequent effect that this had had on their morale. McDevitt’s comments are proof that, for at least some of the men, the belief in the Papal cause, if
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16 M.T. Crean, ‘The Irish in Italy in 1860’, *Seven Hills Magazine* (1908). See also J.P. Conry, ‘The Irish Brigade in Italy’, *Seven Hills Magazine* (1907)  
not the Catholic faith, had been shaken by defeat in Italy, albeit only temporarily. McDevitt asserted that

‘the men, on their arrival were famed and feasted, not only in Cork, but in every city of the United Kingdom where they went […] This reception has done invaluable good to the cause, because such kindness and sympathy shown the poor men on their arrival brought consolation to their troubled hearts […] so much have they been pleased and contented by this reception and kind treatment, that they are now proud of being the Pope’s soldiers, don their old campaigning caps, and are ready to a man again to flock to the standard of his Holiness, if required’. 18

He finished by stating that ‘our men are delighted with the enthusiasm in Ireland […] as for myself, I only fulfilled my obligations to God and man’. 19 D. Moriarty of Killarney continued on this theme, claiming that, when the local men arrived back to Kerry on the train, ‘the whole town met them […] with thundering cheers. Bishops, priests and friars came out to embrace them’. 20 In a similar vein, Richard Sladen, of St. Mary’s Church in Clonmel, stated that the people of that town gave a warm welcome home to their local volunteers. 21 Thus, even though some of the Irish soldiers’ belief in the cause may have been temporarily shaken by their defeat in Italy, it seems that the Irish populace at large had no such doubts. The enthusiastic reception for the returning soldiers gives the impression that many Irish Catholics believed that a great wrong had been done to their spiritual leader by the growing sinister forces of secular modernity and atheism. 22

The desire of some veterans of the Italian campaign to continue exhibiting their loyalty to their spiritual leader Pius IX was shared by Irishmen who were still in

18 John McDevitt to Tobias Kirby, Dublin, 16 November 1860, The Kirby Collection, KIR/1836-1861/2812, PICR
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20 D. Moriarty to Tobias Kirby, Killarney, 16 November 1860, The Kirby Collection, KIR/1836-1861/2815, PICR
21 Richard Sladen to Tobias Kirby, Clonmel, 17 December 1860, The Kirby Collection, KIR/1836-1861/2851, PICR
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Italy, and believed that Rome at least could be kept under Papal control. For example, Joseph Nowlan, of the Irish College in Paris, wrote to Rector Kirby in November 1860 enquiring about his brother Austin who had just arrived in Rome following 'his liberation from the hands of the Piedmontese'. It appears that Austin Nowlan had come from Genoa, where the Irish soldiers had been held after capitulation. Joseph went on to say of his brother that, 'not being yet willing to abandon the service of our Holy Father, he continues with some other defenders of the good and holy cause, the rights of the Holy See to Rome'.

Austin Nowlan was one of a small number of Irish soldiers who decided to remain in Rome for the foreseeable future to aid the Pope in any way they could. They enlisted first in a unit called the Company of St Patrick, and shortly after in the Papal Zouaves. One of these men, Dubliner Albert Delahoyde, unwilling to accept that his efforts had been in vain, remained in Italy until the completion of Italian unification following the final fall of Rome to the Italian army in 1870.

Thus, in order to understand the comparative differences between the role played by Irish Catholic nationalism in motivating the Irish soldiers in Italy and in America, we must first assess why the Papal Irish contingent chose the reactionary option of fighting as a de facto Irish army in Italy and risking their lives to protect the Pope’s temporal power. The soldiers could have selected a less aggressive option, simply accepting the loss in the face of overwhelming odds, or switching their focus to the future of their homeland, i.e. the path chosen by many fellow Irish in the Union army as faith in the Union cause began to diminish in 1862 and 1863. The actions of the men of the Papal Battalion become more understandable when one takes account a number of factors that likely influenced them. Firstly, one must consider the campaign of anticlericalism and anti-Catholicism conducted by the Piedmontese authorities during the 1850s, as a result of which the place of Catholic religion in the Italian peninsula was at stake, including the temporal power of the Papacy. The government of the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia had enacted a policy of anticlericalism which gradually became more focused on anti-Catholicism.

---
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This approach asserted the supremacy of state over church in the kingdom, and it possibly led the Irish soldiers to believe that this process was spreading through Italy, and that they were fighting against fervent enemies of Catholicism rather than supposed fellow Christians. In short, one can surmise that the actions of the Papal Battalion were likely viewed by the Irish soldiers as part of a wider ongoing struggle, waged by the Catholic Church against the forces of secularisation and modernity represented by the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia and its attempt at constructing a modern, secular Italian nation. Some Irish soldiers may even have seen themselves as forces of tradition and conservatism fighting a rising tide of secular modernity in an apparently increasingly atheistic and anti-Catholic world. For Union Irish soldiers, instead, the focus was on the maintenance of a unified American republic as an example and inspiration to Irish nationalists in the future.

Secondly, the Papal Battalion was also seen by some as part of a new wave of Crusaders, to use Chaplain McDevitt’s phrase. As Nir Arielli and Bruce Collins have stated in their edited collection *Transnational Soldiers* (2013), ‘the desire to assist in the struggle of co-religionists […] arguably preserves a form of mobilisation that dates back to the Crusades, if not earlier’. The idea that the Irish soldiers were part of an army which followed in the footsteps of medieval Christians of all social ranks who had travelled to the Middle East in the hope of retaking sacred Christian sites such as Jerusalem from the Muslims, helps in understanding that a similar mind-set characterised the Irish who fought in Italy. Previous popes had called crusades against their enemies closer to home, and Pope Pius IX did the same in 1860. Therefore, it is possible that many Irish soldiers in Italy viewed themselves as holy warriors on a last crusade called to protect the Pope, his lands and the true faith from
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the Piedmontese apostates. This also fits with the Irish soldiers’ narrative of being part of a struggle to oppose a growing nineteenth-century trend towards secular modernity and atheism.\textsuperscript{29} In the Union, instead, there was not a direct threat to the Irish soldiers’ spiritual leader, and therefore no requirement for a crusading campaign to protect the Papacy.\textsuperscript{30}

A further motive used by the Papal Battalion soldiers to justify their actions on the Italian peninsula in 1860 was an attempt to denigrate and delegitimise the right of their opponents to take control of the Papal States. Soldier Michael Crean wrote of the forces lined up against the Pope that they were motivated not by noble reasons as were the Irish soldiers, but instead by ‘greed of power, irreligion, disregard of all principles of justice. To what vile uses the name of liberty was turned in Italy!’ He went on to claim that, as a result of the actions of the Piedmontese Army, ‘patriotism became the synonym of atheism! How sacrilegious robbery was tolerated by the European powers!’ In the eyes of Crean, Piedmontese Prime Minister Count Camillo Cavour was ‘the Evil Genius of the whole movement, and to his foresight and skilful diplomacy must be attributed the changes which took place in Italy, including the spoliation of the Papal States’. For Crean and his fellow soldiers of the Papal Battalion, the Piedmontese campaign was an illegal and illegitimate assault on the peace-loving and noble Papacy and its temporal sovereignty, which took precedence in their minds at all times. For this reason, they saw their Piedmontese opponents, and their supporters, as non-believers. Further proof of this emerges from the use of terms such as ‘irreligion’, ‘atheism’, and ‘sacrilegious’ when referring to the Piedmontese.\textsuperscript{31} For the Union Irish soldiers in Civil War America, however, sectarian hatred, though an issue, was less important and influential, as racial and ethnic prejudices instead came to the fore. As we shall see, many Union Irish soldiers were more preoccupied with denying the right of the Confederacy to secede, and later in the war, with opposing the abolition of slavery and civil rights for African Americans.

\textsuperscript{29} Papenheim, ‘Roma o morte: Culture wars in Italy’, pp. 202-226
\textsuperscript{30} Bruce, \textit{The Harp and the Eagle}
\textsuperscript{31} Crean, ‘The Irish in Italy in 1860’
The primary justification for the Irish soldiers’ presence in Italy, however, was their strong and unshakeable sense of Irish Catholic nationalism.\textsuperscript{32} Don Doyle has stated that ‘nationalism everywhere seemed to advance most successfully when it wrapped itself in religious rhetoric and symbolism and welded national goals to religious mission’.\textsuperscript{33} The Papal Battalion soldiers’ writings provide ample proof of this type of Irish Catholic nationalism, as they were littered with religious references linked to national pride. Many would have agreed with William Hughes, an Irish soldier based in Macerata, who stated that ‘a true spirit of devotion is felt by every man towards his holiness and every man who has asked to go home is looked on as a deserter’.\textsuperscript{34} This intense faith had been fostered by Archbishop Paul Cullen’s ‘devotional revolution’ in Ireland, and was the reason why, for the Irish soldiers, the fate of their spiritual leader in Rome was to the forefront of their concerns at all times.\textsuperscript{35} Any attempt to absorb the Papal States into a unified Italy was an attack both on their spiritual leader and on Catholic Ireland. They could not, therefore, allow this to happen without resisting and, if necessary, laying down their lives for this cause. The fact that the Piedmontese sought to unite Italy and assert its independence from foreign influence was irrelevant in this perspective, despite the obvious parallels between Ireland and Italy – both overwhelmingly Catholic populations that sought independence from a dominant neighbour through the construction of a collective national identity.\textsuperscript{36} For these Irishmen one could not be an Irish Catholic and meekly accept the loss of the Pope’s temporal power, regardless of how hypocritical their actions seemed to others. In their eyes, if Catholicism was extinguished, then the belief in an Irish national identity distinct from Britain would also lose any meaning.

\textsuperscript{33} Doyle, \textit{Nations Divided}, p. 38
\textsuperscript{34} William Hughes to Tobias Kirby, 14 June, 1860, quoted in Cryan, \textit{The Irish and English in Italy’s Risorgimento}, pp. 39-40
Some Papal Battalion Irish soldiers had such passionate beliefs that they either desired to remain following the brief war of 1860, or they wished to serve in Italy again after having returned to Ireland. Other Irishmen, however, chose to exhibit their military skills in America, where at the start of the American Civil War, a large number of Irish enlisted to serve the Union. In a mostly Protestant country, however, accusations of disloyalty and a lack of suitability for republican ideals were likely to be levied against Irish Catholics in the Union Army, and Irish immigrants in general. Many of these seemed to be borne out by subsequent events, especially the New York City Draft Riots of July 1863. This divide was further exacerbated by the fact that many Irish Catholics would lose their faith in the cause of the Union by 1863, due mostly to the horrific casualties suffered amongst the Irish community and the incorporation of slave emancipation into the war aims of the Union. The Irish soldiers’ commitment to Irish Catholic nationalism would, however, help to further the development of the Fenian movement in Ireland and in America.

Catholicism and the Union Irish Soldiers in 1861-1865

In early summer 1861, the American Civil War was in its early stages, and many Irish and Irish Americans enlisted to serve on both sides. Most Irish served in the Union Army, mainly because they had originally arrived into the North American continent either through Boston or New York City; in many cases they were not new arrivals but had been in America for years. Approximately 150,000
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Irish fought for the Union army during the years 1861-1865, and their reasons for doing so varied. These included gaining military experience for a potential future war of independence with Britain, attempting to prove their loyalty to the sceptical citizens of the United States, and even ‘a basic need for the money, clothing, food, and shelter they could earn in the Union Army, though at a tremendous risk’. Susannah Ural Bruce has stated that the Irish and Irish Americans who enlisted as soldiers were all aware of, and focused on, their Irish heritage. A major part of this related to the Catholic religion, which was a daily and essential part of their lives, as was the case for the men who had fought in the Papal Battalion in 1860. The effect of the Catholic religion on the morale of Union Irish soldiers was elaborated upon on numerous occasions throughout the Civil War by Reverend William Corby.

Early in the conflict, Reverend Corby left his position at the University of Notre Dame in Indiana, eventually becoming chaplain to the renowned Irish Brigade, formed by Thomas Francis Meagher to serve the Union Army. Corby joined in 1861, and spent the next 3 years in this role. As in the case of John McDevitt as chaplain to the Papal Battalion, Corby’s writings provide much insight into Union Irish military attitudes to the Catholic faith. With his prominent position in the Irish soldiers’ lives and his role as recorder of events as they occurred, William Corby was actually comparable in stature to McDevitt in Italy. Both men had taken it upon themselves to tend to the Irish soldiers’ spiritual needs, and to ensure that they went into battle believing themselves ready for death. Both men had to sustain the Irish soldiers’ courage and strength of faith to ensure that they would not desert. The behaviour of Irish Catholic soldiers in Italy and in the Union army reflected upon Irish Catholics in general, and even on the wider Catholic Church, and it was imperative in both countries that the men appeared to remain loyal to the cause to which they had committed themselves. Corby and McDevitt were also chroniclers of the exploits of their respective armies, and served a vital role in combating the more negative reports of Irish soldiers presented in Italian, American and British newspapers.

42 Bruce, *The Harp and the Eagle*, pp. 2-3
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They were propagandists for the cause of Irish Catholic nationalism in opposition to anti-Catholicism and anti-Irish sentiment towards the wider Irish immigrant populace.\(^{45}\) Thus, these two men, though officially non-combatants, were still heavily involved in the defence of the Roman Catholic religion outside of Ireland, and they also played a part in defending the reputation of the burgeoning Irish nation in the international stage at mid-nineteenth century.

William Corby revealingly described the Irish soldiers in his care as Christian soldiers – ‘unique in character, unique in faith, unique in nationality’\(^{46}\). For him, the soldiers’ religion, not their Irishness, was the defining element of their characters. He stated that ‘the Catholic soldier is glad to find a priest in the army, or even to see one in the distance, and it always gives him new courage. It is an inestimable privilege for him to make his confession, receive Holy Communion, and attend Mass’\(^{47}\). Corby discussed the links between identity, nation, and religion in the minds of the soldiers under his command. In his opinion, ‘a true Christian soldier has for motto: “Fidelity to God first, and to his country next”; and no man can be a true, reliable patriot who is a traitor to his Maker’\(^{48}\). In other words, a man could not be loyal to his country if he were not firstly loyal to his Catholic religion. Corby emphasised these links when speaking about the celebration of Ireland’s patron saint on one St Patrick’s Day during the war. Patrick was described by Corby as the Apostle of Ireland ‘who brought the light of the Gospel to the whole nation, and turned a pagan country into one thoroughly Christian […] the day is commemorated by the Irish race wherever its sons and daughters are to be found’\(^{49}\). Thus, Irish and Catholic were synonymous and interchangeable terms and concepts in the mind of one of the most influential Irish participants in the American Civil War, a man whose opinions were respected by most Union Irish soldiers. Ordinary Irish soldiers looked to Corby


\(^{46}\) Corby, *Memoirs of Chaplain Life*, p. 31
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and his fellow Catholic chaplains for spiritual guidance and to expand their awareness and understanding of their national identity, as the Irish soldiers of the Papal Battalion did with McDevitt.

In this connection, there is a great deal of evidence on the Catholic religiosity of Irish soldiers in their letters and other writings throughout the war. In June 1861, the *Irish-American* published a letter written from Washington D.C. by Irish soldier John Cogan of the 69th New York, a unit which became part of the Irish Brigade when it was later formed.\(^{50}\) In this missive, Cogan described what he viewed as the impressive sight of his unit all going to mass together in the city one morning. He emphasised the fact that the 69th New York was almost exclusively Irish and Catholic, claiming that, when his colonel requested any non-Catholics to leave the ranks before the unit departed for mass, only one man stepped out. Cogan further highlighted the strict Catholic ethos of this Irish regiment, when he added that ‘we all have to be very religious here; we have to say the Rosary before Mass every morning – we are at Mass every day in the week before breakfast, and everyone has to go to confession. It is a good opportunity for hard sinners’.\(^{51}\) The centrality of the Catholic faith in the daily life of the Union Irish soldiers is very apparent in these statements, even to the extent of almost ostracising those of other beliefs, as it appears that many Union Irishmen only wished to serve together with other Irish Catholics. Many Irish soldiers in the Papal Battalion had expressed a similar wish on arrival in Italy, but ultimately they had been scattered to various locations to serve alongside other nationalities.

The importance of the role of Catholicism in the daily lives of the Union Irishmen who served in the Civil War was apparent on an ongoing basis. On Christmas morning 1861, the Irish Brigade attended morning mass ‘in the open air, in order to accommodate the thronging worshippers’, at Camp California outside Alexandria, Virginia.\(^{52}\) By this time, the Union Army had suffered a sobering defeat
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at Bull Run in July 1861, and it had become clear to all that it would be a long and brutal war.\textsuperscript{53} Irish and Irish American attitudes to the war remained relatively positive at this point, and Thomas Francis Meagher’s Irish Brigade, along with other Union Irish units, soon enlisted significant numbers of recruits.\textsuperscript{54} There were some signs of unrest amongst the Irish soldiers, however, with a concomitant belief that they were discriminated against when it came to issues such as the provision of adequate supplies and the allocation of field commands to Irishmen.\textsuperscript{55} Nevertheless, for the large numbers of Irish soldiers who attended mass in the open air on Christmas Day 1861, it would appear that the belief in the cause, and especially the religious faith, remained strong and central to their lives as Irish in Civil War America. For many Union Irish soldiers, faith in their religion and faith in the Union were one and the same, at least in the early stages of the war, as defending the Union aided the cause and image of the Irish immigrants in the country, and also the unofficial Irish nation on the international stage.\textsuperscript{56}

By March 1862, the Peninsular Campaign was underway, as General George McClellan’s Army of the Potomac advanced south from Washington D.C. towards the Confederate States. The plan entailed an assault on the Confederate capital of Richmond, Virginia, via the peninsula formed by the York and James rivers.\textsuperscript{57} Many Irish soldiers with the Union Army, however, seemed to have been more interested in ensuring that their spiritual needs were met, rather than achieving military results. This was to be a continuing theme in the Irish soldiers’ letters throughout the Civil
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\textsuperscript{55} Bruce, \textit{The Harp and the Eagle}, pp. 82-88. The evidence presented in the previous chapter appears to refute somewhat the latter point on field commands, at least as it related to Irishmen with previous military experience in Italy and/or in the British army in the 1850s. An Irishman’s class and social standing, however, rather than his ethnicity, may also have been factors in the gaining (or not) of promotion
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War. Writing to the *The Pilot of Boston* in March 1862, an unidentified Irish soldier asserted that, for Irish regiments, ‘the need of a Catholic chaplain no one will question, as it is conducive to the spirit of every corps where Catholics are […] to be a true soldier you must be a good man; to be a good man (the Atheist will deny this) you must be a Christian’. 58 The desire of Irish soldiers to feel that their priests watched over them emerges clearly from letters such as these. Meeting this need, however, was to be an ongoing struggle for the Irish in the Union Army throughout the war, and the situation would still not be fully resolved as the war drew to a close in 1865.

Why this quest for spiritual support was so difficult to fulfil is unclear, but it appears that major factors were a lingering anti-Catholicism and a growing isolation for the Irish within the wider American society. 59 Despite the Irish Catholics’ desire to prove themselves loyal, their lack of unconditional support for the Union and its aims as the conflict progressed meant that they were still looked upon with suspicion by many in the North. William B. Kurtz asserts that, therefore, ‘the war alienated most northern Catholics and their leaders, causing them to seek refuge in a separate Catholic subculture after the war’. In other words, Catholics, including the Irish, segregated themselves from mainstream American society, in the Irish case withdrawing into a way of life more akin to the one they had had at home in Ireland. 60 There is some truth in this assertion, though many historians have posited that the Irish generally assimilated into American society to a greater degree than before the Civil War as a result of their service for the Union. 61 I am inclined to agree with William Kurtz, however, that, whatever gains the Irish made through their service in the early stages of the war, they subsequently lost them through growing Irish disenchantment with the Union cause from 1863, and as a result of events such as the New York City Draft Riots. 62
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By July 1862, the campaign for more Catholic priests to serve in Irish units was still to the forefront of the Irish soldiers’ priorities. *The Pilot*, sometimes called the ‘Irishman’s Bible’, due to its influence amongst Irish Catholics in the USA,\(^63\) opined that ‘it is a historic proposition, that Irish soldiers are always bravest when the Priests of their Church are with them. In the main, the Catholics of our Army are Irish. It is, therefore, the demand of prudence to have a full proportion of Catholic Priests in the Army’.\(^64\) The objectiveness of *The Pilot* can be questioned, given its close connections to the Catholic Church in America, but it does appear that having a Catholic priest close at hand was always to the forefront of Irish soldiers’ thoughts. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that, for a number of Irish in the Union Army, spiritual needs were more important to them than the outcome of the war. Perhaps this was understandable, given the large numbers of both Union and Confederate soldiers that had been killed at the Battle of Shiloh in Tennessee the previous April. The two-day battle had seen more than 23,000 men lose their lives, and was the bloodiest battle in American history at the time.\(^65\) It is possible that the ongoing struggle for adequate spiritual support may have been reflective of an increasing feeling of vulnerability amongst many Irish soldiers in the Union Army, given the horrors that they had already witnessed on the battlefield. It is likely also that they believed that their efforts on behalf of their adopted home were underappreciated, and that therefore they may have been searching for meaning in the ongoing sacrifice amidst the carnage.\(^66\)

Throughout the war, William Corby continued to address the religious issues of the Irishmen in his care and to cater for their devotion to their Catholic faith, as well as their spiritual education and development. He described his duties as ‘to instruct such as needed private lessons on special points of religion, and everywhere to elevate the standard of religion, morality, and true patriotism’.\(^67\) On each occasion
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when it was necessary to set up camp, among the first duties for his soldiers was to erect a tent to serve as a church. According to Corby, the men eagerly participated in the mass as much as possible, sometimes even with battles raging close by. Corby also tended to the dead and dying, granted absolution to the men in their final hours, visited those about to be executed, and performed funerals. At the Battle of Antietam in September 1862, he only had time to gallop out on his horse in front of his men as they advanced towards the enemy and grant them a general absolution. On a few occasions, Corby even baptised dying Confederate soldiers, a courtesy that was sometimes extended by Catholic chaplains on the Southern side to their Northern enemy. In this way ‘the priest was a go-between, exercising as best he could, his offices of Christian charity in numerous ways’.69

In January 1863, a Requiem mass was held in St. Patrick’s Cathedral in New York City to commemorate the many soldiers of the Irish Brigade who had fallen the previous month at Fredericksburg, Virginia.70 It is likely that the mood amongst the Irish soldiers at this event was much more negative than in previous years. Due to the rate of attrition on the battlefield, Irish enthusiasm for the war was on the wane. On New Year’s Day 1863, the final version of President Abraham Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation became law, freeing all slaves in the Confederate territories.71 The Civil War was no longer solely about preserving the Union, but instead it had become a war for the abolition of slavery. Given the general animosity between Irish immigrants and African Americans, it was likely that many Union Irish soldiers did not support this war aim.72 It is probable that this development
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marked altogether the end of unconditional support by many Union Irish soldiers for their adopted country, as African Americans, whom many Irish immigrants viewed as inferior beings, would be placed on the same level as the Irish who had already risked their lives defending the Union.⁷³

Even as late as February 1864, *The Pilot* continued to print letters that highlighted what many Irish Catholic soldiers saw as an ongoing lack of religious support in their respective units. An example of this shows in what Thomas Burke, of the 152nd New York, wrote on February 20, 1864:

> ‘it is therefore to be hoped that the American Government, in all respects the best under the sun, the protector and defender of freedom and, consequently, of religious freedom – with its wonted generosity, will, at its earliest convenience, consult for the spiritual wants of the loyal Catholics who peril their lives and their all to sustain the government and institutions of the country’.⁷⁴

With these words, Burke attempted to link Irish loyalty to the Union with a concomitant right to worship as one saw fit – a quality that many Irish soldiers, and migrants in general, viewed as noble and honourable, and part of the privilege of living in America. Burke effectively made a parallel between the struggle for the maintenance of the Union, and the belief that it represented freedom and individual rights, the sometimes challenging Irish quest to openly worship as Catholics outside of Ireland. Though Burke had not served in the Papal Battalion in Italy in 1860, it is possible that he and his peers may have viewed their desire for adequate spiritual sustenance within the Union Army as part of the perceived ongoing struggle against secularism and anti-Catholicism waged in both America and Europe, as many Irish soldiers in Italy had believed.

In the final months of the American Civil War, the lack of Catholic instruction was still an issue for many Irish soldiers. A chaplain of the Army of the

---
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Potomac, C.L. Egan, wrote to *The Pilot* in February 1865 to highlight this concern, only a few weeks before the end of the conflict. Egan claimed that ‘at least one sixth of the whole army of the Potomac and the army of the James, are Catholics. Only two corps of these armies have amongst them any priest at all’. Egan felt that a better effort needed to be made by those in positions of power in the Union Army to increase the number of Catholic priests, ‘to administer the sacraments of our holy religion to the poor soldiers, and particularly to the sick and dying, who are shedding their blood in a just cause, to preserve the integrity of their nation – the best of nations – against those in rebellion to destroy it’.75 Again, the parallel was between the Union Irish sacrifice and their right to worship as Catholics.

It is interesting that those Irishmen who were still willing to lay down their lives for their adopted country were forced to continue agitating to secure adequate spiritual support at this late stage of the Civil War. This issue may have been symptomatic of a wider anti-Irish or anti-Catholic agenda within the Union Army. More likely, however, it simply reflected the fact that the Union military hierarchy had more immediate and pressing concerns than the spiritual needs of Irish immigrant soldiers, many of whom were now fully focused on Ireland, and later would participate in the 1867 Fenian rebellion.76 Ultimately, the religious situation for Union Irish soldiers differed from that in Italy since, while religion remained a major component of Irish identity in Civil War America, the Union Irish soldiers put their Catholicism to more practical uses, especially for personal spiritual support, though sometimes, as highlighted in the previous chapter, also for the pursuit of professional military advancement.

**Conclusion**

Through a close examination of the examples of the Irish soldiers’ religious faith, it is possible to enhance our understanding of transnational Irish Catholic nationalism in the period 1860-1865, and of its role in the wider process of Irish nation-building. Furthermore, an analysis of this type also allows a more in-depth

appreciation of the differences between the Irish soldiers in Italy and in America in the 1860s in relation to the influence of Catholicism on both their motivations and their identity. In the Italian context, the most important religious issue for the young Irishmen in the Papal Battalion was the protection of the Pope’s temporal power. The acknowledgement of the temporal dominion of the Papacy had been one of the cornerstones of European politics for centuries, and it pertained to the Pope’s worldly political influence as opposed to the purely spiritual and intangible. The importance of the Pope’s temporal power for Irish soldiers was unsurprising, given the significance of Rome for the leader of the Irish Catholic Church Paul Cullen, and his subsequent influence on Irish Catholics. Nick Carter has stated that, ‘from an Irish Catholic perspective, Italian nationalism posed an unacceptable threat to the temporal and spiritual authority of the pope’.

Irish Catholic soldiers were unsurprisingly accused of hypocrisy when they supported the Papal cause in opposition to Italian nationalism in 1860. The letter excerpts cited make clear, however, that Irish Papal Battalion soldiers had no doubts as to the righteousness of the Papal cause and to their own sense of Irish Catholic national identity. Chaplain John McDevitt described the Catholic faith of the men around him, and also their willingness to give their lives for the cause. He stated that, at Ancona, the officers and men spent all of their spare time ‘before the siege and during the siege preparing themselves for death, by frequenting the sacraments, in fact they were prepared for a holy death, wishing even to sacrifice themselves for their religion, and for their Supreme Pastor the Pope’. The strongly religious language continued in a later letter when McDevitt added that ‘there is no doubt they all fought like true crusaders, heedless of danger or fatigue, my men I had prepared by Confession and Communion etc. to die well’. The men’s loyalty to the Papacy
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was such that they would have gladly sacrificed themselves to preserve the Papal States for Pius IX. The difficult relationship between Italian patriots and the Roman Catholic Church, therefore, was in direct contrast with the unswerving loyalty to the Papacy displayed by the Catholic Irish.

In Italy in 1860, the Catholic religion, epitomised by an overwhelming love for the Papacy, was the most important factor motivating young Irish soldiers, and the latter’s faith was unshakeable, as they appear to have opposed secularism in any form. As Jennifer O’Brien has highlighted, however, the strength of their religious beliefs and love for the Pope forced Irish Catholics ‘to take up positions on Italian affairs that were inconsistent with their ideological stances on Irish issues’.  

Due to their support for Pope Pius IX, Irish Catholic soldiers clearly denied the right of Italians to fight for Italy’s nationhood, an aim that many Irish cherished at home. The Irish soldiers supported the Papacy’s independence against the Piedmontese, repudiating the right to Italian independence from Austrian and French influence, even though many Irish had a similar wish to dispense with British power in Ireland. The Irish soldiers were also willing to kill to defend the absolutist regime of the Papacy, even though some of them wished for an Irish republic independent of Britain.

Allegations of hypocrisy against the Irishmen who fought to defend the Papal States in 1860, therefore, are impossible to ignore. A better understanding of the context, however, provides us with a more balanced view. To understand the importance of the temporal power of the Papacy in the soldiers' minds, one must appreciate the strength of faith among the Irishmen in the Papal Battalion. Their faith allowed the Irish soldiers to ignore the fact that they fought against fellow Christians in Italy who had many of the same aims as some Irish nationalists. This appears hypocritical and self-serving until one views this decision through the eyes of the Irish volunteers themselves. In their minds, Pius IX was not ‘merely another anachronistic, absolutist ruler to be swept away by the rising tide of the Risorgimento. He was the successor of St. Peter, the source of all religious authority and unity, ordained and protected by God. To attack him was to attack the religion

---

he stood for'.

As devout Catholics whose religion was as important to them as their nationality, the Irish soldiers could not accept this outcome, no matter how insincere and fraudulent it may have seemed to others. This attitude shaped Irish Catholic opposition to the campaign for Italian unity, and accentuated the growing links between Irish nationalism and Catholicism. These links were also very apparent in the military experience of those Irish across the Atlantic Ocean.

Assessing the general role of religion in the American Civil War is also central to any understanding of this conflict. Faith was omnipresent among all those involved, be they Union or Confederate, citizen or soldier, native or immigrant. All participants believed that God was on their side, highlighting the righteousness of their cause in opposition to that of their enemies. Unsurprisingly, this often led to heightened sectarian and ethnic tensions amongst those on the same side, as well as amongst those who opposed each other during the conflict. For the Catholic Irish, therefore, the war ‘promised a way […] to beat back nativism and bigotry by showing that Catholics would serve their country’. The Civil War, in general, enhanced religious nationalism among many ethnic groups in America. This was not just applicable to the Catholic Irish, but also to Catholics of other ethnic origins, as well as Protestants of varying hues.

As in the case of the Papal Battalion, one must acknowledge the deep spirituality and strong Catholic faith of the Irish soldiers in the Union army, though this served much less a motivational role than it had in Italy. It is impossible to appreciate and understand how Irish soldiers and Irish immigrants in general defined themselves in the United States without an appreciation of the role of the Catholic religion as an essential part of their identity.
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discussion of significant themes within the Irish ethnic enclave can afford to exclude the Catholic power [...] the fusion of nationality and religious identification culminated in the rooting of the “Irish-Catholic” linkage as a deep-set cultural identikit’.\textsuperscript{88} Traditionally, Irish service in the Union army has been viewed through the prism of their desire to earn acceptance for the wider Irish Catholic diaspora in the United States.\textsuperscript{89} In this connection, the Civil War was ‘a test of religious and ethnic loyalties’. The role of Catholic priests and chaplains, therefore, was to ‘ensure that the soldiers fought bravely, acted responsibly, and honoured their Catholic faith’. They also had to combat potential Protestant evangelism, both real and imagined.\textsuperscript{90} Irish Catholic bravery and sacrifice during the conflict, especially at battles such as Antietam, temporarily silenced the detractors and ensured a more accepting environment for Irish migrants, even though this did not last.

In this connection, the Union Irish soldiers’ letters were representative of the potent religious beliefs of many Irishmen who served, and they highlight the importance of the Catholic sacraments to men who put their lives at risk, as well as drawing attention to the prevalence of Irish Catholics throughout the Union army. In America, unlike the Irish soldiers who fought in Italy and for whom the cause was all that mattered, Union Irish combatants believed that the most important factor in religious terms was the desire to be spiritually supported. The maintenance of the Union appears to have been of secondary importance in their minds to issues such as the prevalence of Catholic priests in their units and access to the sacraments on the battlefield. The continuous obsession among Irish and Irish Americans with a desire for more Catholic priests in the Union army is instructive. In this, the Union Irishmen were part of a wider social movement fighting for the rights of different ethnic groups in the USA in the nineteenth-century. These ethnic groups, including the Irish, were not willing to abandon their own heritage and sense of identity in the face of nativist antagonism and a belief that they needed to assimilate to American society and values.\textsuperscript{91}
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Thus, Irish Catholic nationalism and its transnational elements served contrasting roles for the Irish soldiers in Italy in 1860 and in America in 1861-1865. In Italy, the Irish soldiers believed that they killed and died in a holy and noble cause, one which they never doubted to be morally and spiritually right. In Civil War America, however, many Irish soldiers viewed religion more individualistically. Whilst some Union Irish soldiers fought to improve the reputation of Catholic Irish immigrants in America, in many cases they concentrated on improving spiritual support networks and sometimes attempting to use these to gain promotion through the Union army ranks. Whilst this was understandable, given that the men risked their lives on a regular basis, it contrasts with the soldiers of the Papal Battalion and their willingness to sacrifice their lives in the name of their spiritual leader. Though both groups had similar aims and religious needs, the different situation in Italy offered a greater potential for martyrdom in the Catholic faith. There was a consistency in both contexts, however, in that the Catholic element of their identity was equally strong in both the Papal Battalion and the Union Irish. Instead of money or more mercenary reasons, these expatriate Irishmen were driven by higher ideals of religion and national identity. It was not religion, however, that primarily motivated the Union Irishmen; rather they focused on the protection of the USA as ‘the republican experiment’. Many Union Irish soldiers viewed the American Civil War as part of a larger struggle, one in which the ‘advocates of popular sovereignty, human equality, and universal emancipation’ were ‘locked in battle against the defenders of dynastic rule, aristocratic privilege, and inherited inequality’. If the relatively young republic in America could not survive the current challenge to its unity, it would not augur well for Irish hopes of a similar political situation in the event of future independence from Britain. As they served the Union, therefore, the Irish soldiers also served Ireland, and defied their perpetual enemy Britain. In the next chapter, I assess the different types of animosity towards Britain and the British as a motivating factor for Irish soldiers who served either in Italy or in America in the 1860s.
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CHAPTER FOUR
Irish Soldiers and the British in 1860 Italy and in Civil War America

In the previous chapter, I assessed the role of transnational Catholicism as an inspiration for Irish soldiers in 1860 to 1865. In the present chapter, I turn to another important motivational factor: animosity towards Britain, and how it influenced Irish expatriate military men and their sense of Irish diasporic identity. The Irishmen whose writings I utilise in this chapter participated either in the Italian Risorgimento or in the American Civil War.¹ By means of comparative analysis of the Irish soldiers in the two conflicts, I aim to highlight the similarities and differences between the soldiers in Italy and those in the Union in relation to their hatred of Britain and the British. Similarly to Irish Catholic nationalism, anti-British sentiment enhanced the belief of many Irish soldiers that they were part of an imagined, though unofficial, Irish nation, as they represented Ireland on the international stage as if it was an independent country free from British influence. As the Irish soldiers elaborated in their letters on what they believed a viable definition of Irishness, they usually did so in opposition to the British ‘Other’.² They also asserted that the Irish soldiers in the Papal Battalion of St. Patrick and in the Union army possessed qualities of bravery and courage that most of their British peers lacked.³

This comparative chapter begins by assessing the role of bitterness towards Britain in the letters of the Irish soldiers involved in the Italian Risorgimento in 1860, and then moves on to the Union Irish soldiers during the American Civil War.⁴

The Papal Battalion Irish soldiers’ letters highlight their enmity to Britain, as they specifically compared their treatment by the British government with their treatment by the leader of a foreign state, Pope Pius IX. In return, there were recurring accusations of hypocrisy from British sources against Irish Catholic soldiers, due to their opposition to Italian unity. The anger towards British and Irish Protestants went hand in hand with the growth of an Irish Catholic nationalism, which presented the Papal Battalion as a de facto Irish army serving outside Ireland and independent of Britain. Similarly, the high level of migration from Ireland to the USA in the nineteenth-century ensured that a sense of ill will towards Britain also transferred across the Atlantic, and linked it inexorably to increasing levels of Irish Catholic nationalism. There existed a strong transatlantic bond between Ireland and America by the time the Union Irish soldiers arrived, and Boston and New York served as the headquarters of nationalist Irish America. The increasing sense of alienation and anti-British feeling among Irish Catholics in the USA was exacerbated by Britain’s perceived unofficial endorsement of the Confederacy from 1861. Thus, Union Irish soldiers, many of whom already despised Britain and all it stood for, found further reasons to oppose Britain in America and, following the Civil War, back on Irish soil in 1867.

An examination of anti-British sentiment in the writings of Papal Battalion and Union Irish soldiers allows us to add another important element to the analysis
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of the development of mid-nineteenth century Irish Catholic nationalism on the international stage, primarily because the latter was, to a great extent, constructed in opposition to British Protestantism.\textsuperscript{9} The role of hatred towards Britain and the British as a motivating theme for Irish soldiers during the 1860s was particularly important during the American Civil War. In this chapter, I argue that Irish loathing towards the British was more significant and prevalent in Civil War America than in 1860 Italy, where instead Catholicism had been more influential as a motivation for Irish soldiers and as a justification for their actions. While anti-British sentiment, along with the Catholic-Protestant divide, influenced the men of the Papal Battalion who served in Italy, it was in the Union army where this influence was greatest. The Irish hostility to their perceived oppressor helped to energise the embryonic Fenian movement in both Ireland and the Union, and inspired Union Irish soldiers to anticipate a time when they would use their military skills in a war for independence from Britain.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{Anglo-Irish antagonism and the Papal Battalion of St Patrick in 1860}

Despite the fact that the Irish people were officially British subjects, many of them believed that they had not been viewed as such during the Great Irish Famine of 1845-51, and that an event of that magnitude would never have been allowed to occur in England, Scotland, or Wales.\textsuperscript{11} As Pope Pius IX sought the support of Catholics throughout Europe in 1860, therefore, anti-British and anti-Protestant sentiment amongst Irish soldiers was an influential factor.\textsuperscript{12} As a result, the Papal
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Battalion was actively promoted by many as a patriotic alternative to the British army. Supporters of the Pope criticised Irishmen who had previously fought for Britain. As Irish Catholics saw it, Britain and successive British administrations had forbidden them the practice of their religion and subjugated them in their own country. Many in Ireland, instead, advocated supporting their spiritual leader, Pope Pius IX, who, they believed, had never forsaken them.\textsuperscript{13}

In his Lenten Pastoral of February 1860, Bishop of Elphin Laurence Gillooly elaborated on the widely held belief that Pius IX had always sought to aid the Irish.\textsuperscript{14} In so doing, Gillooly highlighted why anti-British sentiment influenced young Irishmen about to volunteer to serve the Papacy. He asserted that ‘we are thereby repaying a debt of gratitude; that our Beloved Father loved and aided us first; that when heartless statesmen abandoned us to the ravages of famine and pestilence, the heart of Pius the Ninth bled for our calamities’.\textsuperscript{15} In speeches given during the recruitment of the Papal Battalion, and throughout the fighting in Italy, similar denunciations were made by Irish clerical figures and others about the supposed British hypocrisy in supporting the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia. Archbishop John McHale even asserted that any reports of alleged tyrannical behaviour by Pope Pius IX were lies circulated by the British Government.\textsuperscript{16} This allowed many Irish soldiers to ignore the apparent hypocrisy in their own behaviour, whereby they opposed a unified Italy free of foreign influence, but supported a similarly unified and independent Ireland. Therefore, the Irish who fought in Italy believed they fought not only for Ireland and Catholicism, but also against their hated enemy Britain.

Irish nationalist John Devoy believed that Irish Catholics in Britain were even more intensely anti-British than the Irish at home, as a result of their negative
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experiences living there.\textsuperscript{17} Therefore any cause that Britain supported would invariably be opposed by the Irish.\textsuperscript{18} An example of this was apparent in the actions of Rev. Joseph Meaney, the Rector of St. Anne’s Catholic Church in Blackburn, England. Meaney arrived in Rome on a pilgrimage at the same time as the Irish men of the Papal Battalion, bringing with him a silk banner provided by the Irish Catholics of Blackburn for the Irish soldiers. This banner consisted, on one side, of St Patrick and unidentified Irish national emblems, and on the other, of a portrayal of the Immaculate Conception. The banner was presented to General de Lamoricière, the overall commander of the Papal Army. It was carried by Irish soldiers in some of the battles in September 1860, and was later kept in the Irish College in Rome.\textsuperscript{19} Furthermore, a statement of devotion to the Pope signed by 14,000 British-based Catholics was also presented. London Catholics contributed £2000 to aid the Pope, and many masses throughout Britain featured speakers supporting the Pope’s right to the Papal States. These examples highlight the fact that British society was not uniformly supportive of Garibaldi and Italian nationalism, at least with regard to those of Catholic faith. As we shall see, the same can be said in regard to British support for the Confederacy in 1861-1865.\textsuperscript{20}

Almost from the moment the Irish soldiers left Ireland in early summer 1860 to travel to Italy, there were claims of British interference in their progress.\textsuperscript{21} Under the 1819 British Foreign Enlistment Act, which aimed to prevent British subjects from enlisting in foreign armies, ‘any man entering a foreign service was guilty of misdemeanour punishable by fine and imprisonment, as was anyone helping him to do so, and that any master of a ship conveying such persons was liable to a fine of fifty pounds’.\textsuperscript{22} Therefore, the Irish volunteers decided to travel disguised as workmen, emigrants, or pilgrims. This did not, however, prevent large crowds in
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Ireland from vociferously seeing them off on their endeavour, and there was no real secrecy about the formation and departure of the Papal Battalion. This blatant breach of the law was discussed in the House of Commons, but, in reality, the British government tended to turn a blind eye to Irishmen travelling to Italy. Part of the reason was that British men were breaking the same law in volunteering to fight on the side of Garibaldi. Colonel John Peard, of Irish Protestant descent, was one of the 33 British men who were part of Garibaldi’s expedition in southern Italy.23 Similarly, British men also fought for both the Union and the Confederacy between 1861 and 1865, in some cases side by side with Irish Catholics.24

Throughout events in Italy, there were frequent and ongoing British criticisms of the Irish soldiers’ motivations, and these were borne out on occasion by Irish actions. Not all the Irishmen who travelled to Italy were as fully committed to the Papal cause or as motivated as the majority of the Papal Battalion soldiers. The immediate return to Ireland of a few hundred volunteers before battle began was an indication of the less than noble impulses of some. In this connection, Joseph Dixon wrote to Rector Tobias Kirby in July 1860, having been contacted by the officer in charge of the Papal Battalion, Myles O’Reilly. The latter had informed him of the worrying news that ‘our workmen in Italy will not engage for want of higher pay. Between ourselves I thought that those who went out were prepared to make greater sacrifices and exhibit greater chivalry than this deadlock in the affair shows’. Dixon went on to warn Kirby of the urgency and severity of the matter, as, unless the men were given a wage increase, they would return home, and a large amount of damage

24 For an overview of British service to both the Union and the Confederacy, see the relevant chapters in Dean B. Mahin, *The Blessed Place of Freedom: Europeans in Civil War America*, (Washington, D.C., 2003). See also David T. Gleeson, ‘Proving Their Loyalty to the Republic: English Immigrants and the American Civil War’, in Gleeson & Lewis (eds.), *The Civil War as Global Conflict*, pp. 98-115
would accrue to the reputation of the Papal Battalion and its allegedly noble motives, which the British press would not be slow to exploit.25

The stream of anti-Irish and anti-Papal sentiments in the British press continued throughout the late summer and early autumn of 1860.26 One issue that the British newspapers highlighted in their attempts to discredit the Papal Battalion was the alleged Irish love of alcohol, asserting that this would render the Irish soldiers violent and untrustworthy.27 There was an element of truth to these criticisms, as can be seen in various letters from Italy. For example, Canon Lawrence Forde, an associate of Archbishop Paul Cullen’s, wrote from Spoleto in August of his efforts to resolve issues that concerned the soldiers, including encouragements to the men to send some of their earnings home to their families. He believed that this was ‘the best means of keeping them from drink, our only remaining difficulty’.28 In September, Papal Battalion Chaplain John McDevitt wrote about the men in his charge that ‘a little freedom today with hated liquor has (I fear) made a few of them forget themselves’.29 Issues such as these provided ammunition to those in Britain who considered the Papal Battalion a group of mercenaries rather than ideologically and religiously motivated men. The Irish in Italy responded to attacks by the British and others by emphasising their Irishness and the bravery and self-sacrifice of Irish soldiers, and comparing this unfavourably with the supposedly more nefarious and insidious deeds of the British. The Union Irish soldiers adopted a similar approach in the American Civil War, describing the British as untrustworthy, especially given their perceived support for the Confederacy. Unlike the Papal Battalion Irish, however, the Union Irish used these examples of perceived British dishonesty as propaganda to recruit their countrymen to support the cause of Irish independence as members of the Fenians.30
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In this connection, examples of alleged Irish courage, often in opposition to perceived British - or Italian - cowardice, appeared in various Irish letters from Italy. Chaplain John McDevitt wrote to Tobias Kirby in September 1860, in the midst of the brief war, informing him that his men were eagerly awaiting the order for battle, and that their spirits were high.\textsuperscript{31} The following month, when all military events were concluded, McDevitt reported to Kirby on the brave defence of Ancona, where the Irish soldiers, though vastly outnumbered, held out for almost a week under heavy fire.\textsuperscript{32} McDevitt stated that the Irish soldiers were always courageous, willing to risk their lives even in dangerous situations.\textsuperscript{33} He also claimed that the Irish soldiers were to the forefront of battle, unlike the residents of the Papal State who served the Papal cause, who, he asserted, were not as brave or as patriotic. According to McDevitt, the Irish soldiers were disgusted and devastated when the greater Papal Army surrendered, and
\begin{quote}
‘how indignant the greater number of them felt at capitulating at all without having the satisfaction of strewing the ground around them with the dead bodies of their enemys (sic). I saw a Tipperary fellow come up, when the flag of truce was hoisted […] take off his cap and fling it on the ground with an exclamation of grief and disgust’.\textsuperscript{34}
\end{quote}

Thus, McDevitt was aware of the necessity of highlighting Irish bravery and courage, as well as of defending Irish Catholic motives from questioning in Britain, all with the aim of emphasising that Ireland was a nation of honourable men fit for self-government. As McDevitt and many contemporaries viewed the situation, the Irish soldiers were honest and trustworthy, fighting for a noble cause. The obverse of this was the idea that the British, due to their support for Italian unification, were...
hypocrites who changed their beliefs according to how they affected British interests. McDevitt also wrote from Dublin to Kirby, in this connection, in November 1860, on his return from Italy. He informed Kirby that ‘Lamoricière’s report has done some justice (if not ample) to the conduct of our brave men; at least it has completely shut up the lying “Times” about us’. Criticism of the Papal Battalion continued in the British press, and McDevitt, serving a similar role to the one that Union army Irish Brigade Chaplain William Corby later served in the American Civil War, acted as defender of the Irish military reputation against all detractors, even following the end of the conflict.

For Papal Irish soldiers, further evidence of British dishonesty on the international scene was provided by the so-called ‘Malta Scheme’. There was much scepticism amongst the Irish in Italy regarding the eventual and belated attempts by the British Government to assist the men of the Papal Battalion, who were technically British subjects, in returning to Ireland. Many Irish soldiers believed in the existence of a British scheme to transfer them to Malta, so that they would be stranded there and left with no choice but to join the British Army in order to eventually return safely to Ireland. John McDevitt, writing from incarceration in Genoa, asserted that he had heard many rumours to this effect. A few days later, the same writer described British actions as ‘an Anglo-Cavour scheme of sending our men to Malta – perhaps to starve them into the British service – we are resolved to stand together to the last’. McDevitt explained that, even though the British Government would have shipped the Irish home eventually, the Irish soldiers declined their offer and thus maintained their independence as a de facto Irish army. This episode highlights both the significance of the Papal Battalion in the eyes of its members as an independent Irish army with no requirement or desire of assistance from the British, and a concurrent Irish suspicion of all British actions.
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For these Irish soldiers, enlisting in the immoral and untrustworthy British army was akin to a betrayal of their Irish heritage, and a concomitant acknowledgment that they were British subjects, and therefore that an Irish army and nation did not exist, even in an unofficial capacity. Any British assistance to Irish soldiers would, they believed, undermine their claims to be military representatives of an unofficial Irish nation on the international stage.

In October 1860, a writer identified only as W. contacted Dr Quinn in Ireland from Marseilles, decrying the fact that the British government had made an offer to help the Irish soldiers to return to Ireland. In this letter, he informed the recipient that it was ‘quite impossible to accept any aid from the B. Govt. We are here in opposition to the wishes and to the very principles of the Govt and we cannot suffer the disgrace of allowing our men to depend on them for aid in the hour of their distress’. Therefore, W. believed that any support from the British would have weakened the legitimacy of the cause the Papal Battalion had fought for, which was the protection of the Pope’s temporal sovereignty. Still, a small number of Irishmen were willing to accept assistance from the British. For example, Irish soldier Richard O’Carroll, a prisoner of war in Genoa, complained to his mother that the British Consul in Italy had refused to recognise the Irish soldiers as British subjects. It is difficult to attach much blame to the British Government in this instance, however, as the men had gone to Italy in defiance of British law, in most cases emphatically denying their Britishness whilst proclaiming their Irishness. Though the Irish soldiers were technically British subjects, many only emphasised this fact when it was convenient for them to do so. Ultimately, many wished only to be recognised as Irishmen and representatives of Ireland in an Irish army unit abroad.

In Ireland, the events in Italy in 1860 left ‘public opinion on the Risorgimento divided along the religious fault-line’. The previous and long-standing hostility between Irish Catholics and Irish/British Protestants created a situation whereby they took opposite stances on Italian affairs. Due to the threat that Italian unification posed to the temporal power of Pope Pius IX, Irish Catholics denied
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Italian nationalists the right to a unified independent country, an aim that some Irish Catholic nationalists, especially the Fenians, openly cherished in Ireland. Irish and British Protestants, meanwhile, proclaimed the right of Italians to unify and be independent, whilst denying this same right to the Irish Catholic majority in Ireland. Public opinion on events in Italy in 1860, therefore, divided along religious and sectarian lines in Ireland, while the war of words hardened pre-existing divisions and ‘widened the gulf that separated the Irish from the English, and Irish Catholics from Irish Protestants’. As Donal Kerr states, ‘in the clash between these two identities lay the great tragedy of Anglo-Irish relations in the nineteenth century’. The actions of Papal Battalion soldiers in 1860, and Union Irish Catholic soldiers in 1861-1865, exacerbated these divisions, at a time when both groups helped to create an imagined Irish nation beyond the borders of Ireland, though one in which to be Irish meant to be Catholic and vice versa.

For Irish soldiers in the United States Army prior to the beginning of the American Civil War, a similar potent antagonism towards Britain and Protestants was a major part of their lives. This was epitomised by an incident in New York City in October 1860, the month following the brief conflict in Italy. During an official visit to the city by the Prince of Wales, son of Queen Victoria and future British King, the predominantly Irish 69th New York State Militia, which included Fenians amongst its members, was due to participate in a parade. Led by Colonel Michael Corcoran, exiled from Ireland for his activities in pursuit of Irish independence from Britain, the 69th refused to partake, viewing the Prince of Wales as the future leader of the nation which had oppressed them. Corcoran and his men further believed that Britain had done little to alleviate the worst sufferings of the Great Irish Famine because of anti-Irish bigotry, and a belief that the Irish were an inferior race, which deserved to be left to its fate. Corcoran stated, in an attempt to explain his actions and prove to doubting Americans that he was loyal to the United States: ‘although I am a citizen of America, I am a native of Ireland….In the Prince of Wales I
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recognised the representative of my country’s oppressors […] in honouring that personage, I would be dishonouring the memories, and renouncing the principles of that land of patriots’. 47

The timing of this protest leads one to believe that the Irish in the United States were aware of, and influenced by, concurrent events in Italy, as the actions of Corcoran occurred only weeks after the defeat of the Papal Army and the Pope’s subsequent loss of the Papal States. As the British Government had been seen to be supporting the forces of Italian unification in opposition to the spiritual leader of fervent Irish Catholics such as Corcoran and his men, it is likely that the latter’s actions were influenced by news from Rome of the endeavours of the Papal Battalion, especially those reports that were critical of the Papal soldiers and their motives. 48

Furthermore, Corcoran and the more astute soldiers amongst his unit possibly viewed their non-participation in the parade as part of an ongoing transnational and transatlantic Irish Catholic struggle for survival against Britain and Protestantism. Many Irish soldiers in the Papal Battalion felt that they were engaged in a similar struggle, which followed Irishmen from Ireland to Italy and subsequently to America. The Irish soldiers believed that Catholic religion was under siege, especially from British Protestantism, a feeling accentuated by the open desire of Evangelicals in Britain to use the campaign for Italian unification in 1860 to convert the entire Italian peninsula to the Protestant faith. 49

In America, however, the perceived threat from Britain was much more serious, as Irish soldiers believed that, if Britain achieved its aim of destroying the American republic, it meant the end of hopes for Irish independence. Therefore, Irish service in the Union from 1861 was simultaneously a patriotic service to Ireland, and part of the long lead up to the 1867 Fenian rebellion.

Anglo-Irish antagonism and the Union Irish Soldiers in 1861-1865

By 1861, the focus of many Irish soldiers had drifted away from Ireland or the Papacy to America with the impending Civil War. Irish Catholic soldiers found fertile ground for their hatred of Britain and the Protestant faith on their arrivals in
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New York and Boston harbours. There were already many potential Irish and Irish American recruits for the Union Army in America, among them Thomas Francis Meagher. Meagher had previously been a rebel to the British Crown in Ireland, and was exiled to Van Diemen’s Land (modern day Tasmania) following a conviction under the Treason Felony Act in 1848. He subsequently fought for the Union in the American Civil War against the Confederate ‘rebels’ to the United States. From his arrival in the USA in the early 1850s, Meagher had denied any affinity with the British in his speeches and writings. Instead, he claimed America as a sister country of Ireland, and stated that he believed that Britain’s approval of the South’s right to secede was inconsistent with its previous denunciations of slavery. Meagher highlighted the unofficial British support of the Confederacy as the reason Irish immigrants in America should support the Union. His influential writings, and his position as an Irish nationalist hero of 1848, proved an inspiration to many Union Irish soldiers during the conflict.

Early in the Civil War, political hostility between the Union and Britain increased, due to alleged British support for the Confederate States. Queen Victoria’s Proclamation of Neutrality in May 1861 appeared to recognise both the Union and the Confederacy as belligerent nations, thereby amounting to a tacit acknowledgement of the Confederate States. The situation was exacerbated by the Trent incident in November, when two representatives of the Confederate government were taken off a British ship by Union naval representatives, resulting in
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further increased tension with the British government. Incidents such as these were welcomed in the Irish community in the Union and at home in Ireland. Throughout the Civil War, the letters of many Irish soldiers made it clear that they hoped hostilities would break out between Britain and the Union. In the event of such a conflict, they believed that the Union would side with Ireland in her desire to become independent of Britain. Though the two countries came relatively close to engagement over the Trent affair, it was improbable that, following the end of the Civil War, the reconstituted United States would start another conflict against Britain, or, even less likely, that the Union would risk a battle on two fronts by engaging Britain and the Confederacy at the same time.

Antipathy towards Britain, therefore, was very apparent in the writings of both ordinary Irish soldiers in the Union forces, and in Irish American newspapers, during the Civil War. A January 1862 editorial discussing potential future conflict between Britain and the United States, as a result of the possibility of British support for the Confederacy during the American Civil War, allowed Catholic newspaper The Pilot to express its anger towards Britain. In its role as both shaper and enunciator of the views of Irish immigrants in America, The Pilot asserted that ‘to be sure, Ireland sides with the stars and stripes. What is the red flag of perfidious Albion to the Irish race? The oppressions of seven hundred years answer the question’. In so doing, The Pilot highlighted the fact that Irish loyalties were first and foremost to their adopted home on the North American continent in the event of a war between the USA (or the Union) and Britain, though not ever above the interests of Ireland. In a similar vein, the New York Irish-American published a letter written by Riordan, in the 63rd New York Volunteers, in February 1862. Riordan expressed the anti-British sentiments of many of his fellow Irish when he claimed that
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‘while there is a feeling here to whip the rebels, there is double the same feeling in camp for the opportunity of striking a blow on the cursed enemies of our dear old Erin [……] a chance to strike a blow at a more deadly enemy of our race than the Southern traitors [……] every man here is watching eagerly for a chance of war with England, when they will pay up for old sores’. 58

Therefore, the fact that the Union Irish soldiers were apparently focused to a much greater extent on a future war against Britain rather than on the ongoing American conflict highlights the hatred of the British that pervaded Union Irish ranks. The assertion by Riordan that Union Irish soldiers were more angered by the actions of Britain than by those of the Confederacy emphasises the Irish desire to serve their homeland in the quest for an independent Irish nation. An editorial from the Dundalk Democrat, reprinted in The Pilot the following month, further expounded on the link in the Irish minds between helping the Union and harming Britain. The anonymous author stated that, observing the Civil War from an Irish point of view, the Irish people wanted to see the Confederacy defeated, since, if the American Republic was divided and weakened, the hopes for Irish independence would be irreparably damaged; Britain would no longer fear America and its possible intervention in Irish affairs. The editorial claimed that, to this end, Britain intended to continue fomenting strife and animosity between the Union and the Confederacy. 59 Yet, the Irish contribution to the Union cause was almost always predicated on how it could ultimately benefit the cause of Irish independence.

The detestation of Britain was a transatlantic phenomenon, in that it was not confined solely to Irish immigrants and soldiers in America, but was also very visible and influential in Britain. Two years after the Pope’s loss of the Papal States in 1860, London’s Hyde Park witnessed riots on successive Sundays as mainly Irish Catholics attacked supporters of Garibaldi. In July 1862, Garibaldi had made another attempt to take Rome, unsupported and unapproved by King Victor Emmanuel. Defeated at Aspromonte by soldiers of the Kingdom of Italy, Garibaldi was shot in the foot - a sacrifice that made him appear more heroic and martyr-like in the eyes of
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his supporters. Meanwhile, Italian anti-Catholic preacher Alessandro Gavazzi was in Ireland, denouncing the Pope and the Papal Brigade, with predictably riotous results. These events were fresh in Irish minds when a rally in support of Garibaldi was held in London’s Hyde Park in late September 1862. The event, and another the following week in the same location, resulted in attacks by a large number of Irish Catholic immigrants. This, unsurprisingly, increased the antagonism between the Irish and the British, in both Britain and further afield. When viewed in conjunction with the later New York City Draft Riots of July 1863, a picture emerges of bitter and frustrated Irish immigrants in two of the most influential world cities, London and New York, who believed, in many cases accurately, that they were viewed as second class citizens and were unwelcome in both places. In their angry reactions we can see an attempt to preserve the Irish Catholic identity abroad, possibly the only thread that held them together as a community in both places. The increasing prevalence and growing popularity of St Patrick’s Day parades throughout the Irish diaspora from 1860 was also indicative of a concurrent desire amongst Irish immigrants, particularly in America and Britain, to maintain their culture in settings that were increasingly hostile towards them.

The animosity towards Britain prevalent amongst Irish soldiers in America was epitomised in a report of the presentation of a sword to Lieutenant Colonel Smith printed in the New York Irish-American in November 1862. Smith served in the 164th New York, part of Corcoran’s Irish Legion. Colonel Smith, after thanking those present, swore that the sword ‘would never be sheathed until it drank some Saxon blood and a lasting blow was struck for the country of his birth’.

This statement highlighted the ongoing love for Ireland amongst Union Irish soldiers and

officers, and their desire to put their military experience to use against the British in the future. Thus, Smith expressed the view, held by many Irish in the Union army, that Irish soldiers were training to serve Ireland, hopefully aided by the United States, following the latter’s reunification. Given that the previous September had seen both the bloodiest day in US history at Antietam and the issuing of Lincoln’s Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation, it is not surprising that Irish soldiers were becoming progressively more disinterested and disillusioned with the Civil War in America.\(^6^5\) Many felt that their sacrifice in the name of the Union was unappreciated. Instead, the focus of Union Irish soldiers increasingly turned towards a war of independence in Ireland against the real enemy Britain, since they believed that they would then be potentially sacrificing their lives for a country and a people that would appreciate their selflessness.

The hope of a battle against the hated British enemy was widespread amongst Union Irish soldiers throughout the conflict. An example of this emerges from a letter published in March 1863 by an unidentified Tipperary soldier of the 9th New York Volunteer Cavalry, who contacted the New York Irish-American expressing his willingness to put his military expertise to the service of Ireland. This individual wrote of ‘the heart-rending sufferings of the Irish people, through famine and starvation, caused by the heartless tyranny of ever-to-be-cursed England […] the cry of thousands is spreading across the Atlantic for succour, for bread. May the next cry we hear from the same quarter be for arms and blood’.\(^6^6\) The timing of this statement was revealing. On the first day of January 1863, Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation became law, which freed all black slaves held in Confederate territories, and also provided for the potential enlistment of African American soldiers into the Union forces.\(^6^7\) Together with this, the US Congress enacted a draft


in March whereby each state would be required to provide a certain number of recruits conscripted from the general population. In the Union Irish ranks, there existed high levels of anti-black prejudice,\(^{68}\) as well as a view of conscription as a tool of government oppression, which many equated with previous actions by the British government in Ireland. In this situation, many Irish soldiers believed that the country of their birth should take priority from then on.\(^{69}\)

The international nature of the antagonism between Irish and British remained apparent throughout 1862 and into 1863, not just in Ireland and Britain, but also in America and Italy. Alongside the Garibaldi riots in London, the anti-British sentiments cherished by many Papal Battalion veterans were still potent. For example, in June 1863, Charles Edward Lynch of Dublin wrote to Tobias Kirby in Rome. After having informed Kirby that he had previously served in the Papal Battalion, and that he regretted not remaining in Italy in late 1860 to continue to serve Pope Pius IX, Lynch stated that

‘I am now nominated for a commission in the English service, which I must say I do not at all like for many reasons, first I have a great dislike to England and the English, secondly to live on my pay in the English service I should be continually on foreign service perhaps in India or some bad climate, and thirdly the want of religion and morality in the [British] army is quite disgusting’.\(^{70}\)

Thus, Lynch perceived the British as dishonest and immoral, as did many Irish soldiers, who instead considered themselves devoutly religious. Anti-British sentiment, therefore, was acutely transnational, because Irish migrants and soldiers were influenced by events and beliefs in Ireland, Britain, Italy, and America. Through popular newspapers, and letters written by Irish soldiers and former soldiers, this animosity was perpetuated from place to place, enhancing and exacerbating the tensions between Irish and British on both sides of the Atlantic and beyond.
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In a June 1863 letter to his father-in-law in Ireland, Irish American Peter Welsh provided another insight into Irish views on America compared to Britain, and he also listed the reasons why new arrivals from Ireland may have chosen to serve in the Union Army. Welsh began by saying that ‘here we have a free government, just law and a constitution which guarantees equal rights and privileges to all. Here thousands of the sons and daughters of Ireland have come to seek a refuge from tyranny and persecution at home and thousands will continue to come’.

He spoke of the Irish contributions to the creation and development of the United States since the American War of Independence. Welsh claimed that ‘Irishmen helped to free it from the yoke of Britain and to build on this soil the best and most liberal government in the world. They have borne a willing and a formidable part in the subsequent wars of the country with England’. While this was a reference to the Irish soldiers’ military experience in the service of the Union, it was also an attempt to link Ireland and the USA in the past, present, and future, against the supposed common British enemy. Soldiers such as Welsh often emphasised Irish dedication to sacrifice for the Union, intimating that this favour should be returned by the US Army following the Civil War by helping Ireland’s quest for self-determination. Claims such as these became more prevalent as the Civil War progressed, because many Irish soldiers were increasingly concerned with the future of Ireland. This consideration was driven by a growing sense of Irish nationhood abroad and an increasing desire for an independent Irish nation at home.

Thus, a significant segment of Union Irish soldiers were convinced that if they helped to maintain the Union, this contribution would be reciprocated by the USA in a war for Irish independence. Writing in the aftermath of the Union victory at the Battle of Gettysburg in 1863, Felix Brannigan expressed hope for American support in a war for the liberation of Ireland. Brannigan, a Congressional Medal of Honour recipient the previous year at Chancellorsville, expressed his belief that ‘the American Eagle will pitch into the hide of the British lion if for no other reason than
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to show how easily and scientifically the game bird can “clean out” the clumsy, unwieldy brute’. However unlikely the hope that the United States would turn its attention to the freedom of Ireland from Britain following the Civil War, it is further evidence of a contemporary awareness amongst Union Irish soldiers of the transatlantic links and contacts between America, Ireland, and Britain, as well as of an appreciation that events in America influenced those in Europe and vice versa. The Irish soldiers were acutely aware that everything they did affected not just the Union, but also their homeland and Britain.

The animosity of Union Irish soldiers towards Britain was reciprocated by the animosity of the British towards the Irish during the Civil War. An example of this occurred in July 1863, when *The Pilot* reprinted an article from London based magazine *Punch*, which celebrated the losses of the Irish Brigade. *Punch* stated that

‘tis an ill wind that blows nobody good. The civil war in America may have bereft the North of many valuable citizens, but has also lightened it of a considerable number of rowdies and ruffians […] So may the foes of England fall! […] ‘They have worked the rowdies and the Irish out of the Union. The rowdies and the Irish are the scum of the earth’.

The level of vitriol, together with the description of the Irish as the foes of England, is very telling, and highlights the way in which the Irish were viewed by many in Britain, despite their official status as fellow subjects. These comments served as evidence in Irish eyes of the hypocrisy which many had always believed the British guilty of. These words were written only days before the New York City Draft Riots of July 1863, which occurred in response to conscription; the writer may have subsequently felt validated in these comments following the events. One of the reasons that the Irish were so protective of the American republic was their belief that all white men were equal there and free to follow their desires. In this connection, it is possible that many of the Irish who partook in the disturbances in New York did so because they viewed coercion into the Union Army as akin to the

---

74 Felix Brannigan to his father, undated, *Felix Brannigan Papers, 1861-1863*, MSS5070, LOC
75 ‘An English Yell of Triumph’, *The Pilot*, July 11, 1863, Vol. 26, p. 4, Microfilm M4B665, Roll 017, BPL
British oppression that they had left Ireland to avoid, and this may partly explain the ferocity of Irish rage during the Draft Riots.  

Sectarian problems between Catholics and Protestants were also an issue in America, as they were in Ireland and Britain. Many Union Irish soldiers believed that Catholic units, such as the Irish Brigade, were discriminated against when it came to leaves of absence, supplies, etc. They felt that more leeway and support was granted to units that were American in ethnicity and Protestant in religion. As the war went on, many Irish soldiers were also horrified with reports of the taking, and sometimes destruction, of Catholic churches in the Confederacy by invading Protestant soldiers in the Union Army. There were reports of sacramental vessels being stolen by Union soldiers, and vestments being worn in a mocking fashion. One Irish soldier stated in April 1863 that ‘we did not enlist to see our Churches burned and robbed by a horde of miserable scoundrels […] we saw plenty of that at home’. This enlightening comment highlights how some Irish soldiers were making parallels between their treatment by the British and by the Americans. It is further evidence of a growing Irish Catholic disillusion with the war, and, for some soldiers, with their new home, where they believed they were increasingly unappreciated and unwelcome. Being a Catholic in America, it appeared to many, left one as socially outcast as it had done in Ireland.

David P. Conyngham, who had been an aide to Thomas Francis Meagher, was one of the first to write a post-war history of Irish involvement in the Civil War. In The Irish Brigade and its Campaigns, (1867), Conyngham expressed the bitterness towards Britain that many Irish soldiers had carried with them in America.
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Conyngham asked the question of how ‘England is blind to the ruin that a people so numerous and powerful in foreign countries, and hating her so intensely, is sure to bring on her in her hour of trouble? It might be politic to try conciliation, instead of coercion, on such a people’.\(^80\) John Francis Maguire, meanwhile, spoke of those American soldiers of Irish descent who had absorbed the bad blood of their forefathers for the British. He asserted that, though these Irish Americans were proud of the United States as the land of their birth, they also harboured an affection for Ireland as the home of their ancestors, and a concomitant hostility towards Britain as the traditional oppressor of Ireland.\(^81\) Thus, anti-British sentiment grew stronger amongst the Irish and Irish American community in America as the 1860s progressed, reinforced by opposing British and Irish actions during the Civil War. Many Irish men who fought for the Union all felt to varying degrees that their service not only assisted the Union but also harmed Britain. Therefore, their time in the Union Army was akin to service in an unofficial Irish army, as in the case of the Papal Battalion. This inspired many Irish soldiers to join the Fenian movement in America and, in some cases, to return to Ireland to fight in the Irish rebellion in 1867.\(^82\) This Irish nationalism highlights previously little-known transnational links between Ireland, Italy, and the United States in relation to nation-building in the nineteenth-century. The unofficial Irish nation of which the Papal Battalion and Union Irish soldiers were representatives was partially founded on hatred of Britain carried by Irishmen outside Ireland in Italy and, to a greater extent, in America.

**Conclusion**

In Italy, in 1860, ‘Ireland’s longstanding religious animosities were projected onto the struggle between the Pope and the Piedmontese’. British and Irish Protestant support for Italian unification reinforced a sense of righteousness for Irish Catholic soldiers.\(^83\) The British and Irish Protestant believers in Italian unification were viewed as hypocrites by Irish Catholics for preaching liberty in Italy and the right to rebel against foreign rulers, yet practicing the opposite in Ireland. Irish Catholics,
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however, had left themselves equally open to accusations of duplicity. Irishmen such as those who served in the Papal Battalion should have been very supportive of ‘the Italian struggle for independence and unity’, but the potential loss of the Pope’s temporal power in order to achieve a unified and independent Italy placed them in an impossible position. Unless Italy was to be a federation of states under different rulers, thereby allowing the Pope to maintain his lands and his temporal power, there could be little Irish Catholic support for Italian unification, regardless of similar desires for nationhood and independence among many Irish Catholics at home.

In this connection, Ciarán O’Carroll and Anne O’Connor have both highlighted how the Papal Battalion was a vehicle for anti-British rhetoric, which helped to drive Irish Catholicism and Irish nationalism even closer together at mid-nineteenth century. O’Carroll states that, during the monster meetings convened by the Catholic Church at which young Irishmen were encouraged to support the Pope, ‘speakers frequently combined declarations of papal support with denunciation of the British government’. In this way, ‘Italy became a proxy or extension of domestic debates in Ireland’. The unadulterated delight in the British press at what was perceived as the failure of the Papal Battalion exacerbated this anti-British attitude amongst Irish soldiers. O’Connor wrote of the concurrent ‘greening’ of the venture, in that the formation of the Papal Battalion provided an outlet for Irish Catholic nationalism and a de facto Irish army representing the country on the international stage. The Irish soldiers in Italy, therefore, were fighting not only for the Pope but also for the honour of the Irish flag and their country, in opposition to the aims of their British leaders. This Irish pride manifested itself in a number of ways within
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and without Ireland, with a growing opposition to the British and the ruling
Protestant class at home, and an increasing sense of anti-British feeling among Irish
soldiers in Italy in 1860, and later in America.

Similarly, Irish Catholic migration into the USA during the nineteenth-
century had brought with it Irish antipathy towards Britain. As most Irish who
enlisted served the Union, this anti-British sentiment was enhanced from 1861 by the
possibility of British support for the Confederate States, which was partly
strengthened in Britain by racial prejudice towards African Americans and a desire
to see the dissolution of the USA before it superseded Britain as a world power. In
America, Catholicism was less important as a motivation for Union Irish soldiers,
though sectarian violence was still an issue in the shape of clashes between Catholics
and Protestants which mirrored those in Ireland and Britain. Ultimately, contempt
towards Britain was much more influential amongst Irish soldiers in the Union Army
than it had been in the Papal Battalion. Irish soldiers in the Union Army viewed the
British as a double threat, both to their dreams of Irish independence and to the
security of their new home in America. Thus, they equated service in the Union
Army with service to Ireland, as the maintenance of the Union would strengthen the
country they viewed as a sanctuary, as well as providing them with invaluable
military training that they could use in the service of Ireland against Britain.

Therefore, attitudes towards Britain influenced many Irish soldiers who
fought in Italy in 1860 and in America in 1861-1865, though anti-British sentiment
was much more prevalent and influential in the latter. British actions during the
American Civil War ensured that many Irish nationalists within and without Ireland
supported the cause of the Union. A major reason for this was the perceived British
support for the Confederacy, with its parallel aim of destroying the United States and
its example as a successful and independent republic. It was the belief of many Irish
and Irish Americans that Britain recognised the United States as its main competitor
as a global power, and thus the British hoped to destroy the Union by aiding the
Confederacy. Yet, despite Union Irish opinions to the contrary, the British viewpoint
on the American Civil War was not simplistic unqualified support for the
Confederacy. As amongst the Irish in Ireland and in America, opinion varied in
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Britain on the question of righteousness in the conflict. Some in Britain still believed in the need for Anglo-Saxon Protestant solidarity in the face of a perceived threat. Alongside this, there were British officers and soldiers serving in the Union Army, in some instances side by side with Irishmen.\(^90\) Other individuals followed their conscience and did not support the Confederacy due to the existence of slavery, especially as nineteenth-century transatlantic abolitionism had strengthened the ties between Britain and the northern United States.\(^91\)

Actual British support for the Confederacy, however, often came from simple self-interest, especially for the many people dependent on the cotton industry in areas such as Lancashire, Cheshire, Scotland and Ulster. This was often disguised by paternalistic rhetoric in Britain, similar to that espoused about the Irish in Ireland, which claimed that slaves were better off with their masters. There were also those who advocated the right of the Confederate States to secede and create a new nation.\(^92\) These claims were guaranteed to inflame Irish opinion, as many in Ireland considered that the British government had long stood in the way of a similar desire in Ireland to secede from the United Kingdom and proclaim independence. Some in Britain, still angry about the loss of the British colonies in the eighteenth-century, saw the United States as disloyal colonists, and took delight in what they considered the failure of a democratic republic. Others in Britain were racists, who saw any attempt to improve the position of supposedly inferior African Americans as an affront to the natural order.\(^93\) These subtle nuances in British opinion, however, were of little concern to many Union Irish soldiers, who seized on the perceived
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\(^93\) Blackett, *Divided Hearts*, pp. 6-47; Hugh Dubrulle, “‘If it is still impossible…to advocate slavery…it has…become a habit persistently to write down freedom’; Britain, the Civil War, and Race’, in Gleeson & Lewis (eds.), *The Civil War as Global Conflict*, pp. 56-84; Lawrence Goldman, “A Total Misconception”: Lincoln, the Civil War, and the British, 1860-1865’, in Carwardine & Sexton (eds.), *The Global Lincoln*, pp. 107-122
widespread British support for the Confederacy as a motivating factor for both their service to the Union and their hopes for Ireland.

Ultimately, therefore, Irish bitterness towards Britain played a major and influential role in motivating Irish soldiers in the Union Army and, to a lesser extent, the Papal Battalion. Despite R.V. Comerford’s claims to the contrary, bitterness towards Britain was prevalent in Ireland in the 1850s.94 This anti-British sentiment partly motivated Irishmen to serve in Italy to protect the Pope’s temporal power, as these men and their contemporaries were aware of British support for Italian unification.95 The detestation of Britain, however, was not as influential a motivating factor in Italy as Catholic religion. Intense Catholicism was the prime inspiration for the majority of young Irishmen who joined the Papal Battalion in 1860. It was a different story, instead, for the Irishmen in America, especially as their new home was perceived as being under threat from Britain, which allegedly wished to see the breakup of the United States.96 The anti-British sentiment there was accentuated for Irish soldiers by the religious situation in America, where Protestants and Catholics regularly came into conflict, as they had done for centuries in Ireland. Therefore, whilst the level of bitterness towards Britain differed from individual to individual, the general experience of Irish soldiers in the Union Army exacerbated these negative feelings. It also encouraged many Irish soldiers to support a potential future war for independence in Ireland following the American Civil War, thus highlighting the transnational context of the conflict, since Irish soldiers genuinely believed that ‘America’s war would be their training tour’, a military education that was to be utilised on their return home.97 In the next chapter, I assess a final theme: Irish interactions with other ethnicities, and how they affected the motivations of Irish soldiers who served either in Italy or in America.
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CHAPTER FIVE

Irish soldiers and Ethnic Interaction in 1860 Italy and in Civil War America

Having previously discussed Irish soldiers’ Roman Catholicism and their animosity towards Britain in Italy in 1860 and in the Union in 1861-1865, in this chapter I assess a third theme present in the Irish soldiers’ letters: interactions with other ethnic groups in Italy and America. The Irishmen at the heart of this chapter also participated either in the Italian Risorgimento or in the American Civil War.¹ A comparative assessment of the interactions with other ethnic groups experienced by Irish soldiers in 1860 Italy and in Civil War America highlights the similarities and differences between the Irish perceptions of different nationalities and ethnicities in the two countries.² I specifically focus on the interaction between Irish soldiers, residents of the Papal States, and Piedmontese soldiers in Italy during 1860, and between Union Irish soldiers, white Protestant Americans, and African Americans in the American Civil War, because these were the groups with whom the Irish soldiers had most contact. This chapter shows the existence of high levels of animosity and prejudice exhibited by Irish soldiers towards these groups and vice versa. It also highlights the growing Irish national pride resulting from Irish soldiers’ interactions with other ethnicities, which contributed to an increasing sense of unofficial Irish nationhood amongst them, though to varying degrees.³ Thus, by comparing the two contexts of Italy and the Union in the 1860s, we can gain new insights into the similarities and differences between the roles of locally conditioned ideas about race


and ethnicities among Irish soldiers, and their conceptions of the nation-building processes in which they were engaged.

For many Irish soldiers who served in the Papal States, their arrival on the European continent in early summer 1860 was their first trip away from home, and also their first experience of encountering other ethnicities. Scholars have examined the reception experienced by the Irish soldiers in Italy, and have highlighted the nativism and prejudice of Italian residents towards Papal Army Irish soldiers who arrived on their soil.\(^4\) This was despite the fact that the largest contingent in the Papal Army consisted of Papal State citizens. Anne O’Connor, in particular, has written on the mutual contempt between the Irish soldiers, the residents of the Papal States, and the Piedmontese soldiers. She has highlighted the lack of understanding and empathy for the Irish in the Papal States and in the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia. The Piedmontese press described the Irish in offensive terms and even termed them ‘giant savages’ with animal-like features. There were many reports of Irish drunkenness and insubordination in Piedmontese newspapers, and the Irish soldiers were often depicted as mercenaries.\(^5\) The present exploration of the Irish soldiers’ interactions with the Piedmontese soldiers and the residents of the Papal States supports this view, though with the exception of some rare moments of mutual respect between the groups.

In the United States, the situation differed, however, as ‘the presence of slavery and the racist attitudes’ that had outlasted the creation of the republic ‘bequeathed a legacy of racial conflict […] that had no parallel across the Atlantic’.\(^6\) The sectional crisis of the 1850s had convinced many in the US North that the power of slaveholders was a far greater threat to the American republic than the Catholics.\(^7\)


\(^5\) Anne O’Connor, ‘Giant and Brutal Islanders’: The Italian Response to the Irish Papal Brigade’, in Barr, Finelli & O’Connor (eds.), Nation/Nazione, pp. 96-109


\(^7\) On the crisis of the 1850s, see especially William W. Freehling, The Road to Disunion, Volume II: Secessionists Triumphant 1854-1861, (New York, 2007); David Potter, The Impending Crisis, 1848-1861, (New York, 1976); Eric Foner, Free Soil, Free Labour, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War, (New York, 1995); William E. Gienapp, The Origins of the
This resulted in a slow demise of American nativism and hatred of immigrants after 1856. A belief in the superior nature of the American Anglo-Saxon race was, however, deeply embedded in American society. Scientific theories about superior and inferior races, common also in Europe in this period, gave rise to a parallel fear of difference. Union Irish Catholic soldiers absorbed much of this rhetoric and often agreed with it, but also experienced nativist prejudice and a strong anti-Irish backlash on occasion. The Irish soldiers responded to these by attacking those whom they saw as a threat, and by emphasising their commitment, firstly to the Union, and later, to a future Irish independent republic.

Ethnicity and the Papal Battalion of St Patrick in 1860

It was on the Italian peninsula, in 1860 where many young Irish soldiers first both practiced and encountered ethnic prejudice. In the letters written by Papal Battalion members, one repeatedly sees Irish soldiers, and the Irish people in general, portrayed as noble and honourable, whilst in comparison the citizens of the Papal States and the soldiers of Piedmont-Sardinia were almost universally derided. Not long after his arrival, Dublin man Richard O’Carroll claimed that the Papal State residents ‘are some of them entirely opposed against the Pope, also they are so much against us Irish coming out that they would assassinate some of us if they got the

---


opportunity’. Fellow Dubliner Albert Delahoyde described his regiment having rotten fruit thrown at them by the locals and claimed that ‘we are anything but liked by the lower class’. For Papal Battalion Irish soldiers such as O’Carroll and Delahoyde, the unwelcoming reception that they received came as a shock. This was exacerbated by the fact that it was the people of the Papal States who expressed this hostility. Many Irish soldiers were convinced that they had come to save the people of the Papal States from the Piedmontese invaders, and therefore they believed that they would be welcomed as heroes. The citizens of the Papal States, however, felt differently. The region of Romagna had already voted for annexation to Piedmont-Sardinia, and the remainder of the Papal States had made clear its opposition to a Papal rule dependent on the presence of a French garrison in Rome. The Irish were part of a force that stood in the way of the incorporation of the Papal States into a united Italy; therefore Italian discontent with the Papal Army and its Irish soldiers was understandable. The Irishmen responded to this by attacking the character of the Papal State residents. O’Carroll, for example, described Italians as ‘a slovenly, lazy race, [that] scarcely ever work’. The relationship between the people of the Papal States and the soldiers of the Papal Army continued to deteriorate over the course of the brief conflict.

Irish-Italian relations were difficult also due to the behaviour of some Irish soldiers while they were in Italy. O’Carroll admitted that the Papal Battalion contained a lot of uncivilised and uneducated young men from many parts of Ireland, and that it would take time to bring them under control. There were some genuinely humorous cultural interactions amongst the anger. A particularly troublesome group seems to have come from County Kerry in the southwest of Ireland, and it was known rather unimaginatively as ‘the Kerry Boys’. George Berkeley claimed that these men had been banished from their local parish by the

11 Albert Delahoyde to his mother, Ancona, 24 July 1860, 24 Letters from Albert De La Hoyde 1860-70, MS13280, NLI
13 Richard A. O’Carroll to his mother, Rome, 27 June 1860, Letters to his mother [in Francis Street, Dublin] from Richard A. O’Carroll, MS21522, NLI
14 Richard A. O’Carroll to his mother, Rome, 27 June 1860, Letters to his mother [in Francis Street, Dublin] from Richard A. O’Carroll, MS21522, NLI
priest who wanted to be rid of them.\textsuperscript{15} They featured prominently in other writings of the events of 1860. Papal soldier A.J. Abraham claimed that ‘the Kerry Boys’ were ‘so ignorant that when they had serviettes on the dinner table asked what the towels were for, and when helped to salad said that they didn’t eat raw cabbage’! Abraham also stated that ‘some of the Kerry men sold their old clothes and got drunk and we had a lot to do to keep them quiet’.\textsuperscript{16} This behaviour was distasteful to the residents of the Papal States, and was likely to inflame the bitterness and antagonism between the Irish and the Italians.

Though quite educated by the standards of the time, Albert Delahoyde was another Papal Battalion soldier who did not exhibit much tolerance in his dealings with the people in Italy, as his disposition towards residents of the Papal States was quite prejudiced.\textsuperscript{17} In many of his letters, Delahoyde compared Ireland and the Irish people with the other ethnicities which he encountered. An intense dislike of the people who lived in the Papal States emerges clearly from one of his first letters home in July 1860. Delahoyde wrote that ‘the people are dirty looking and lazy, the lower class cheat you if they can, indeed I think that there is a great want of principle amongst the Italians comparatively with other countries, and Ireland in particular’.\textsuperscript{18} It was a common ploy of Irish soldiers in the Papal Battalion, and later those in the Union army, to contrast unfavourably their opponents with themselves. There was a pervasive sentiment amongst Irish soldiers abroad that they were representatives of an unofficial Irish nation, and, if an independent Irish nation was ever to become a reality, it was necessary to present Ireland and the Irish as noble, honourable and capable of self-rule in opposition to those who, they believed, lacked such qualities. Therefore, if the Italians, whom the Irish soldiers believed were inferior to the Irish, deserved independence, it was a logical conclusion that the Irish should be considered more than worthy of the same.

Delahoyde also took the relatively unusual step of drawing physical comparisons between Irish and Italian women to make his point about perceived

\textsuperscript{15} Berkeley, \textit{The Irish Battalion in the Papal Army of 1860}, p. 21
\textsuperscript{16} A.J. Abraham, ‘Diary and Reminiscences of the Invasion of the Papal States by the Sardian (sic) Army and the Capitulation of Spoleto in 1860’, 274/12, Part II, No. 7, Irish Papal Brigade Reports, \textit{Cullen Papers}, DDA
\textsuperscript{17} Florry O’Driscoll, ‘Confounding the Garibaldian Liars: The Letters of Albert Delahoyde, Irish Soldier of the Papal Battalion of St Patrick and Papal Zouave in Italy, 1860-1870’, \textit{Studi Irlandesi}, No. 6 (2016), pp. 49-63
\textsuperscript{18} Albert Delahoyde to his mother, Ancona, 14 July 1860, 24 \textit{Letters from Albert De La Hoyde 1860-70}, MS13280, NLI
Irish ethnic superiority. He stated more than once that he did not find the local women of the Papal States attractive, and instead missed the complexions of Irish girls.\(^{19}\) Again, there was a wider implication, however, that Delahoyde believed Irish women to be purer and more principled than Italian women. His level of animosity is quite revealing, especially given the fact that there had not yet been any military engagement between the Papal Army and the Piedmontese. It is likely, though, that many soldiers of the Papal Battalion were aware that Garibaldi and his men were in control of most of the island of Sicily by July 1860, and were about to invade mainland Italy.\(^{20}\) Thus, the Irish soldiers would have looked on the residents of the Papal States who supported the Italian unification movement, including the women of the region, as traitors to Pope Pius IX. This belief created a lack of sympathy or respect for any civilians encountered by many Irish soldiers in the Papal States, whilst also elevating the Irish character in their minds.

The obverse aspect of animosity between Irish soldiers and the residents of the Papal States was an increasing sense of Irish national pride and patriotism among the former. This manifested itself initially in exuberant praise of the Irishmen who served in Italy, even before the battles began. According to Brother Aloysius Howlin, ‘the most glorious thing for Ireland and for the men she sent was the fact of their going at all’.\(^{21}\) Albert Delahoyde spoke proudly of the Irish soldiers in the Papal Battalion on numerous occasions. In July 1860, he stated that ‘I hope we will show, if necessary to Garibaldi and Co., that his chasseurs are no match for Erin’s hardy sinews’.\(^{22}\) Delahoyde claimed that the overall commander of the Papal Army, General de Lamoricière, took a special interest in the progress of the Papal Battalion. According to him, the General ‘seems to expect a scrimmage soon. He must take great interest in us, as he has reviewed us four times already, a thing he never does

---

\(^{19}\) Albert Delahoyde to his mother, Ancona, 24 July 1860, 24 Letters from Albert De La Hoyde 1860-70, MS13280, NLI
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with the other troops’. This pride was part of a growing sense of Irish Catholic nationalism, not just in Italy, but also in Ireland and in America. The implication was that the Irish were superior military men to both the Italians and all other nationalities in the Papal Army, and therefore, if a perceived inferior race such as the Italians were entitled to their own independent nation, an allegedly advanced ethnicity such as the Irish were surely even more deserving.

There was one attempt made, most likely by Papal State citizens sympathetic to the Piedmontese, to find common cause with Irish soldiers before military engagements commenced. A pamphlet in English was distributed to the Irishmen, exhorting them to ‘shake hands with the Italians your equals and brothers in Christ’. This publication expressed the Italians’ love and respect for Christianity, but stated their determination to overthrow the temporal power of the Papacy, which the Irish in Italy had pledged themselves to defend to the death. The pamphlet ended with the words ‘Viva Italy – Viva Ireland – Viva the union [of] the true followers of Christ’. It appears, though, that this sole attempt at rapprochement was rejected out of hand by the Irish soldiers, and was further decried in the Irish press. This is unsurprising, as the Irish soldiers, and their supporters at home, were unlikely to betray the cause, given their previous unconditional support for the Papacy. Nevertheless, it is revealing of a brief opportunity, however slight, for unity and cooperation between the Irish and the residents of the Papal States on the basis of their shared Catholic faith. The protection of the temporal power of the Papacy, though, was the intractable issue. As long as there was any threat to their spiritual leader, there could never be an alliance between the Irish soldiers and those Italians who wished to take the Papal States from the control of the Papacy. As I discuss later, this attitude contrasted with that of many Union Irish soldiers in Civil War America, who lost faith in the cause of the Union as the war continued, and began to prioritise

23 Albert Delahoyde to his mother, Ancona, 24 July 1860, 24 Letters from Albert De La Hayde 1860-70, MS13280, NLI
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potential future Irish independence and nationhood over the Union which they had pledged to defend to the death.27

Despite the animosity between Irish and Italians, one coterie of Papal State residents was unsurprisingly respected and venerated by Irish soldiers - the Roman Catholic clergy. In August 1860, Canon Laurence Forde wrote to the Rector of the Irish College in Rome, Tobias Kirby, from Spoleto, asserting that ‘the military aspect of affairs too is most satisfactory. We are the only soldiers and do all the garrison duty of town. Monsignore Delegato is most kind to us, thinks highly of us, and is most considerate for our defeats and failings’.28 This excerpt highlights a cooperation between Irish soldiers and Italian clergy that one would expect, given the fact that both harboured the same aim, the protection of the Pope’s temporal power. This comment is revealing, however, also from a comparative viewpoint. The Irish soldiers were in Italy primarily because of their Catholic faith and love of the Pope, which had been exploited by some members of the Irish clergy to convince men to volunteer. The attitude of the people in the Papal States to their clergy, however, was quite different. The Papal State residents’ Italian nationalism and desire to see their region as part of a united Italy took precedence over their Catholic religion.29 Had the Irish soldiers been fighting in Ireland for the independence of their own country, it is possible that their religion would similarly have had less influence on their actions, though it is true that the Irish Catholic clergy had prevented many Irishmen from volunteering to partake in the most recent rebellion in Ireland in 1848.30

Once battle between the Piedmontese and the Papal Army commenced in September 1860, a trend of Irish self-praise continued in the letters of Irish soldiers. They repeatedly highlighted the bravery and self-sacrifice of Irish military men, and

27 The considerable difference in the length of the two conflicts may also have been a significant factor in explaining Irish soldiers’ commitment to the Papal cause in Italy and their counterparts’ waning commitment to the Union cause in America.
28 L Forde to Tobias Kirby, Spoleto, 24 August 1860, The Kirby Collection, KIR/1836-1861/2740, PICR
29 David I. Kertzer, ‘Religion and Society, 1789-1892’, in Davis (ed.), Italy in the Nineteenth Century 1796-1900, pp. 181-205
often unfavourably contrasted this against what they viewed as the cowardice of others. This vilification did not apply just to the Piedmontese enemy, but also, on some occasions, to fellow members of the Papal Army, who were criticised for their perceived lack of dedication to the Papal cause. Primarily, however, the Papal Battalion soldiers were focused on eulogising themselves and their companions. Richard O’Carroll described himself as having ‘the spirit and heart of as true an Irishman as ever entered a [battle]field’. Michael Crean emphasised Irish bravery by claiming that, at the first encounter between Piedmontese forces and the Papal Army in Perugia, the ‘Irish company protested against surrender and a small body at one of the gates kept up a spirited fire until they were over-powered by superior numbers’. Albert Delahoyde also stated that Irish soldiers had received praise for their performance in the battle at Perugia. In a letter which was published in the Irish nationalist newspaper The Nation in October 1860, Delahoyde told that ‘the General regrets extremely the want of Irishmen, he was astonished at their conduct yesterday […] he has even said he’d give all his Swiss and natives for 5,000 Irish’. According to Crean, the same General de Lamoricière stated that, if all his men had fought at the later battle of Castelfidardo as the Irish did, then the result would have been different. Crean also mentioned the Irishmen who resisted during the siege of Ancona, asserting that ‘Lamoricière on more than one occasion referred in terms of the highest praise to their fidelity and bravery. [Piedmontese] Generals Brignone and Fanti in their official reports confirmed his statement’. Thus, Irish soldiers were regularly portrayed, by themselves as well as others, as superior to all other military men in Italy, as part of an unofficial transnational campaign to emphasise Ireland’s right to nationhood.
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34 M.T. Crean, ‘The Irish in Italy in 1860’, Seven Hills Magazine (1908). See also J.P. Conry, ‘The Irish Brigade in Italy’, Seven Hills Magazine (1907)
On occasion, however, there were grudging acknowledgements by the Irish soldiers of the bravery of those on the other side of the conflict in Italy. Even given the conflicting ideological positions of the Irish and the Piedmontese, men thrown together in the heat of battle unsurprisingly sometimes developed an admiration for the other side. During the final assault on Spoleto, Michael Crean stated that the Piedmontese ‘came on with a rush up the narrow road in the most gallant fashion’, with their leader General Brignone at the head of his men. Witnessing all the bodies of his foes afterwards, Crean said that ‘it was impossible to repress a feeling of sympathy and admiration for the brave men who in the face of a deadly fire, without cover or shelter, went on without swerving’. Crean highlighted the effectiveness of the solitary gun in the fortress in repelling the assault, and the fact that the men operating it were also Italians, though on that occasion from the Papal States. After the Papal Army surrendered and marched out of Spoleto on the following morning, Crean claimed that they were treated respectfully by their foes.36 Any acknowledgement of Italian courage by Irishmen was, however, relatively exceptional. This is understandable, as many members of the Papal Battalion viewed as one of their duties to ensure that the truth, or their version of it, was told to the outside world and to the Irish people who had invested so much faith in them. In other words, since the Irish soldiers were depicted as mercenaries and drunkards by the Piedmontese and the British press, the soldiers took it upon themselves to correct this perception through their letters, many of which were printed in Irish newspapers, while also taking the opportunity to deride and undermine their opponents and the cause for which they fought.37

In this connection, Papal Battalion Chaplain John McDevitt, serving the same role as his contemporary William Corby later did in the Union Irish Brigade, was crucial in countering negative Italian and British depictions of the Papal Battalion.38 McDevitt wrote to Rector Kirby in October 1860, after the brief fighting had ended, venting his bitterness and disgust towards the Italians with whom he had

36 Crean, ‘The Irish in Italy in 1860’
come in contact, both the Piedmontese and the residents of the Papal States. In his first letter, written while he was incarcerated in Genoa, he stated that the men were treated inhumanely and brutally by their Italian captors. Later, McDevitt informed Kirby that the Irish soldiers still in Italy ‘have a sovereign contempt for nearly all classes of Italians’. Perhaps surprisingly, he also admitted that the Piedmontese officers defended the Irish soldiers when they were being abused by civilians of the Papal States following their surrender. Myles O’Reilly confirmed this in a letter to Kirby, claiming that the Piedmontese officers had treated him and his men like gentlemen. O’Reilly did, however, perpetuate the prevailing Irish view of the residents of the Papal State. He wrote that ‘I must fully confirm from my experience this judgement of the central Italians. Manhood is at a discount: cowardice, the shrinking from personal danger is called “la solita prudenza Romana”. In conversation no one speaks of resistance where the slightest danger might be incurred’. The Papal State Italians were portrayed as cowards who retreated in the face of the minutest danger, in contrast to the brave and fearless Irish soldiers who were willing to die for the cause in which they believed, that of their spiritual leader Pope Pius IX. Thus, the reader was left with the impression of the Irish as a noble and superior race which was well equipped for self-rule and independent nationhood.

The propaganda battle between Irish and Italians to claim the moral high ground continued after the brief war in Italy. Michael Crean charged that the reputation of the Irishmen who defended Spoleto was later defamed by Italians, adding that ‘it is characteristic of the Italian mind, or at least a certain section of it, to indulge in such vulgar scurrilities’. Despite his earlier acknowledgement of their bravery, Crean was critical of the Papal Army Italians in Perugia, contrasting their behaviour with what he believed was the highest standard of Irish bravery. He claimed that ‘it has been asserted and I fear with good reason, that the Italians either
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through cowardice or treachery failed in their duty. It was the common belief at the
time that General Pimodan [one of the Papal Army commanders] was shot by his
own men’. Crean added that witnesses he had spoken to had confirmed that the
Italians soldiers of the Papal Army had not covered themselves with glory, and he
stated that

‘we at all events in Ireland have no reason to blush for the part we took on
behalf of the Holy Father in his hour of need. We sympathise with all peoples
who strive for national freedom, but we revere the sacred traditions of our
Church and we think it desirable that its action and administration should be
unfettered by any infidel control’.43

The above comment highlights how the Irish viewed the Italians, both those in the
Papal Army and their Piedmontese enemies. It is revealing to hear Crean refer to his
opponents, who were all fellow Christians, as infidels, traditionally a pejorative term
used for those viewed as non-believers in the central tenets of one’s religion,
members of a separate religion, or even lacking any religious belief.44 This helps us
to understand how the Irish soldiers justified fighting against another ethnic group
that equally sought national independence. If they considered their enemy as
somehow less faithful Christians, then it was easier to rationalise opposing them,
even though their nation-building aims may have been comparable. In the eyes of
many Papal Battalion Irish soldiers, religion and nationalism were inextricably
linked, and one could not exist without the other. Therefore, if the Italians were
considered to be less dedicated to Catholicism than Irish soldiers, this left the former
undeserving of having an independent country of their own, and one which had, the
Irish soldiers believed, illegally appropriated the lands of the Papacy.

Ultimately, the Irish soldiers’ letters provide evidence of both the lack of
mutual understanding, and the consequent strained relations, between the Irish and
the Piedmontese soldiers and Papal State residents in 1860. These cultural
differences were exacerbated by the bitterness of a military campaign. The mutual
contempt between the Irish and the various groups they encountered on the Italian

43 Crean, ‘The Irish in Italy in 1860’
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peninsula led the Irish soldiers to put forward a positive identification of themselves in opposition to the negative foreign ‘Other’, similarly to their attitude to the British in both Italy and in the Union. Papal Battalion Irish soldiers constantly contrasted the allegedly heroic Irish attitudes with the imagined lack of these by Italians. They eulogised Ireland and the Irish as good and morally pure, whilst they gave their perceived enemy negative attributes. A similar mind-set emerged also from the attitudes of Union Irish soldiers in the American Civil War. As I discuss next, the Irish in the Union despised other ethnic groups, especially African Americans and white Americans, even more so than the Irish in Italy had reviled the citizens of the Papal States and the Piedmontese soldiers. Thus, this highlights the importance, in the minds of the Irish soldiers in Italy and in the Union, of the necessity of positively representing Ireland abroad, in opposition to other groups, through an ethnic regiment that served as an outlet for nationalism and as a nucleus for a future Irish nation.

Ethnicity and the Union Irish Soldiers in 1861-1865

In The Harp and the Eagle (2006), Susannah Ural Bruce examined the attitudes of the Irish to other ethnic groups in America at the time of the Civil War.\footnote{Bruce, The Harp and the Eagle, pp. 40-41. See also Samito, Becoming American Under Fire, pp. 23-24; Fleche, ‘Irish and African Americans in the Civil War Era’, pp. 156-162} She concluded that they held dual alliances to both Ireland and the Union in the early years of the conflict, but, as the war went on, they focused more on Ireland and less on the Union. This, in turn, resulted in an increased antagonism between the Irish and other ethnic groups. Thus, as Don Doyle has written, ‘the Civil War at once eroded and confirmed ethnic and religious prejudices towards the Irish’.\footnote{Doyle, The Cause of All Nations, p. 174} In this connection, the actions of Irish soldiers during the war varied, sometimes motivated by a desire to reunite the USA, and other times by what was most beneficial to Ireland. As a result, American attitudes to the Irish also changed as Irish priorities shifted, ultimately exacerbating the pre-existing divide between the Irish soldiers and other ethnic groups in America.

The most influential leading Irish and Irish-American newspapers in Boston and New York City loudly proclaimed Irish soldiers’ loyalty to the Union from the early days of the American Civil War. A July 1861 editorial in the New York Irish-
American stated that, in every previous crisis of US history, the American people had had the sympathies of the people of Ireland on their side. It went on to add that ‘the intellects, the arms, and the fortunes of Irish-Americans have been generously devoted to the preservation of the Union and the protection of its interests and its honour’. 47 The Union Irish soldiers’ letters followed a similar pattern, highlighting Irish participation in, and respect for, hallowed traditions and celebrations in American life. For example, Felix Brannigan wrote of his regiment’s Fourth of July celebrations. Based at Camp Scott on Staten Island in July 1861, Brannigan wrote that ‘we were treated (!) to the usual routine of Fourth of July celebrations. Foremost, grand parade of the whole Brigade until 12’. This was followed by ‘afternoon orations, prayers, speeches, reading of the “Declaration” etc. etc., all of which was no doubt exceedingly agreeable to the spectators but rather hard on us, as the day was scorching’. 48 As the United States at that time was a recently divided country at war, it is reasonable to assume that commemorations of independence from the British may have taken on even more significance in 1861, both in the Union and in the Confederacy, especially given that the latter wished to legitimate its own quest for independence. 49 Thus, the importance of the Union Irish participation and their displays of loyalty at the beginning of the Civil War was clear and would have been appreciated by ordinary Americans.

Despite the attachment of Irish soldiers to the Union, however, for many of them their Irish roots remained important during the war. This sometimes resulted in displays of respect and cooperation between the Irish in the Union and those in the Confederacy, even within the first year of engagement. An example of this occurred when Colonel Michael Corcoran was captured and held in a South Carolina prison, apparently with Confederate Irishmen guarding him. Corcoran wrote from captivity to Captain James B Kirker, and his letter was published in the New York Irish-American in February 1862. In this, Corcoran reminded his reader that ‘you are aware that I have been most devoutly attached to my native countrymen, but since
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my arrival in the South I have received such marked tokens of their affection that my love for them has (if possible) increased’. Corcoran felt that ‘their attachment to and fond remembrance of the Old Land has undergone no change, and amid the turmoil that now exists they can sympathise with a suffering countryman’. The significance of this episode is that it appears that Irishmen in both the Union and the Confederate armies were as concerned with issues in Ireland as in America, and, as the war continued and circumstances changed, this became more and more apparent on both sides.

Many Irish soldiers in the Union Army were not keen on mixing with other ethnic groups, and desired, if possible, to serve in uniform Irish units alongside their fellow countrymen and co-religionists. This was often due to both their ethnic prejudice and to attempts to portray Irish soldiers fighting together as uniquely brave. In March 1862, The Pilot claimed that the Irish volunteer would willingly and bravely serve in any unit in the Union Army, but if he was placed in a solely Irish regiment, he would be more patriotic towards both America and Ireland. In the eyes of the writer, the Irish soldier ‘will not only have the preservation of the Union in view, but the honour of his native country to illustrate. A division of Irish volunteers would be the most united body in the army’. In the opinion of The Pilot, the Irish volunteers would be bound together ‘by religious sympathy, glorying in their inheritance of untarnished traditional fame, and animated by a desire to show to the American people that they appreciate and prize American institutions, they would form a special legion in their moral fitness for military service in the cause of the Union’. Thus, the Catholic religion was invoked to signify unity and solidarity between Irish soldiers in the Union, as it had been previously in Italy, together with an emphasis on the alleged Irish moral superiority over other ethnic groups. The latter phenomenon had also occurred at the time of the brief war of 1860, as Irish
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soldiers in Italy continually compared Irish bravery and dedication to the Papal cause with perceived Italian cowardice and lack of idealism.

As in Italy, there were numerous examples of Union Irish praise and self-promotion as the war progressed, often at the expense of other ethnic groups. In March 1862, Boston’s Thomas Cass wrote of his fellow Irish and Irish American soldiers that the foundation of their characters ‘rests upon duties performed in the military service of our country as citizen soldiers; thus setting a glorious example for every true American citizen. To the noble daring of such men our country is much indebted for the glorious patriotism by them displayed’. He went on to say that ‘the honour of our State and flag can be justly confided to our keeping, and that we can be justly allowed the proud privilege of defending its honour, as well as the glorious emblem of our common country – the Stars and Stripes’.  

Captain John W. Mahan expressed similar sentiments when he highlighted Irish sacrifice, as well as the racial prejudice suffered by the Irish in the past. According to Mahan, numerous Irish regiments had left for the war, all to aid in the defence of their adopted home. He added that Irishmen were fighting everywhere, alongside those Americans who had, in many cases, been very unwelcoming to Irish immigrants in the past. Mahan further wrote that the Irishmen of Massachusetts demanded a token of acknowledgement of their services in the Civil War. He believed that these Irishmen had shown themselves ‘not only worthy to have confided to their the honour of the American flag, but, also forgetting the past prejudices and errors of Massachusetts, have in the heat of battle proudly borne aloft the banner of the old Bay State, and shed their blood in its defence’. He finished by stating that the brave service of the regiments of Irishmen from Massachusetts enhanced the reputation of the Irish in America, and in so doing it made life easier for future Irish immigrants by placing them in a position of respect and admiration in the eyes of Americans. The belief that they proved themselves and their descendants worthy of US citizenship through their military service was common amongst Union Irish soldiers, especially in the early days of the Civil War.
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Furthermore, some Irish soldiers were quite knowledgeable about American history, and the wider historical significance inherent in their service. These men believed themselves to be following in the footsteps of heroic American patriots of previous conflicts. Felix Brannigan exhibited an appreciation of history in April 1862, when his regiment was in camp outside Yorktown, scene of the 1781 British capitulation under Lord Cornwallis during the American War of Independence. The Irishman stated that

‘we are surrounded with the remains of rebel camps, and are not far from the scene of Cornwallis’ surrender. This is classic ground in American history, and the “Fifth” shall not forget it. The colonies were here made independent, what ground more fit for a victory to Liberty or freemen to fall on?’ 56

The linking in this quote of the Irish service to the Union army with those Irish and Americans who fought in the American Revolution was part of an uncoordinated and unofficial campaign by Irish soldiers to lay claim to American citizenship. In the words of Christian Samito, ‘Irish Americans […] turned to history to affirm their inclusion in American society, while they wrestled at the same time with their own loyalty to Ireland and the United States’. 57 Throughout the American Civil War, many Union Irish soldiers attempted to link Ireland and America, in the past, present, and future. Irish soldiers’ letters asserted that Ireland and the Union had a common enemy in Britain, and that as Ireland had placed its people at the service of America, the favour should be returned in any Irish campaign for independence.

In a missive in May 1862, Felix Brannigan continued the theme of Irish courage and willingness to sacrifice all in the service of the Union. Encamped near West Point, Brannigan wrote that ‘the Irish Brigade relieved us in the afternoon and fully kept up the honour of the name. I tell you they fought like devils and were mown down by the score, yet the papers never mention them’. 58 This last comment gives the impression that some Irish soldiers believed that American newspapers chose not to acknowledge Irish bravery, and therefore the task of telling their version of the truth fell to Irish writers. This was a task that Irish soldiers in Italy in 1860 had
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also believed necessary – the need to counter what they perceived as anti-Irish propaganda. There was also a recurring sentiment, as in Italy, that the Irish were superior when it came to bravery and nobility in battle. Irish soldiers, as had occurred on many previous occasions, emphasised their imagined superiority as fighting men in contrast to other ethnic groups, including white Americans, whom many Irish considered to be inferior soldiers and quite often physical cowards. Therefore, the Irish soldiers believed themselves superior and more worthy of citizenship due to their willingness to lay down their lives for a country other than the one in which they had been born.

From the early stages of the Civil War, there had been varying levels of discord between Irish soldiers who had volunteered and white Protestant Americans, especially those who were not in uniform. Felix Brannigan questioned why all American men were not, by late summer 1862, rushing to join the Union Army to defend their country, and explained that

‘if [the Confederate capital] Richmond does not speedily fall we will have England and France to cope with. There may be some who will say – let them come, we can whip them. We can’t do it. There is not patriotism enough in this country to do it [….] It makes even a foreigner’s blood boil to look at the apathy of a country which is looked upon by the oppressed of all nations as a haven of liberty and rest’. 59

This ethnic antagonism worked both ways. There were letters and editorials in American newspapers, often by unidentified correspondents, claiming to give examples of cowardice and drunkenness amongst Irish regiments. Some of these accounts even attempted to state that certain Irish regiments had not actually been present at specific battles, leading to refutations of these claims in subsequent issues of Irish-American newspapers. Thomas Francis Meagher was at the forefront of this defence, writing in August 1862 to disclaim a report on the Battle of Gaines’ Mill, signed only by ‘X’, which purported to deny ‘the Irish Brigade its honourable participation in the conflict of that day’. Meagher emphasised that he was not in the habit of claiming any credit for the Irish Brigade that it did not fully deserve. He
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finished his rebuttal by stating sarcastically that ‘if these are not indisputable facts, your correspondent is correct, and the Irish Brigade has been indulging in a brilliant hallucination, delightfully shared until now by your very obedient servant, Thomas Francis Meagher’.60 This example is informative, as it highlights both how many people in America still viewed the Irish soldiers in a negative light, despite their service to the Union cause, as well as the ethnic defensiveness of Irish soldiers. Derogatory assertions such as these were major reasons why Irish soldiers’ priorities began to turn away from the Union and towards Ireland, though the looming emancipation of African American slaves was also an extremely influential factor.

Alongside Irish Catholic ethnic pride, and a sense of military superiority over white Protestant Americans, a potent sense of racial prejudice towards African Americans also characterised Irish soldiers in the Union army.61 Some of the language used by Union Irish soldiers would be considered offensive by the modern reader. For example, Felix Brannigan discussed the potential of serving with black men, in so doing highlighting the attitude of many Irish soldiers towards African Americans. Brannigan stated that ‘we don’t want to fight side by side with the nigger. We think we are a too superior race for that’.62 An August 1862 editorial in The Pilot bemoaned the fact that white Irishmen struggled to find work over black men. The author asked ‘where the whites find it difficult to earn a subsistence, what right has the negro either to preference or to equality, or to admission?....What has the African done for America?....We pity his condition but it is unjust to put him in the balance with the white labourer’.63 In November 1862, The Pilot continued this attack on African Americans by asking ‘where else on the surface of this globe can individuals be found so stultified as to compare an Irishman to a negro?....the Irish, thank God!, have too much self-respect to “go” for anything that will place a negro on the same grade in the labour market with themselves’.64 Two months prior to the latter statement, Lincoln had issued the Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation, which was to free the slaves in all Confederate held territories once it became law on
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January 1, 1863. The Proclamation, thus, threatened to place African Americans on a similar, though not quite equal, level to the poor white Irish. In this context, it was not surprising that Union Irish soldiers, and Irish American newspapers, loudly proclaimed both Irish ethnic superiority and perceived African American inferiority. This process became even more important following emancipation and growing numbers of Union Irish dead.

Irish soldier Thomas Galwey provided further evidence of the much vaunted Union Irish bravery and pride when he described the Irish Brigade’s performance at the Battle of Fredericksburg in Virginia in December 1862, where the Union Army suffered horrendous losses following successive assaults on Marye’s Heights. According to Galwey

‘the Irish Brigade come out from the city in glorious style, their green Sunbursts waving, as they have waved on many a bloody field before, in the thickest of the fight where the grim and thankless butchery of war is done, every man with a sprig of green in his cap, and a half-laughing, half-murderous look in his eye’. 66

The Union Army of the Potomac had more than 13,000 casualties over the four days of the Battle of Fredericksburg. 67 For many Union Irish, the sacrifice was further evidence not only of their courage, but also of their immense dedication to a country that was theirs only by adoption. This again convinced many Irish soldiers that they were superior fighters than other ethnic groups, including African Americans and white Americans. It was also the beginning of the end for the unequivocal Irish
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support for the Union war effort, especially after Lincoln’s signing of the Emancipation Proclamation on New Year’s Day 1863.

Irish attitudes towards the Union gradually changed and became less positive as casualties mounted and war aims altered. Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation and the potential freeing of millions of enslaved blacks led many Union Irish soldiers to question their dedication to the Union cause. In March 1863, Private Peter Casey of the 23rd Illinois Volunteers wrote that the enemies of the Irish race and the Catholic religion were numerous throughout America, but despite this, Irish immigrants were still willing to defend their new home. Casey concluded, however, that ‘black abolitionism is potent in our times […] the Negro and not the welfare of the country is what most engrosses their minds and perhaps when all is over they will turn their attention to the burning of convents and churches as they have done before’. Apart from highlighting the link in the Irish soldiers’ minds between abolitionism, nativism and Protestantism, this statement aids our understanding of the Irish fear of black emancipation. Many Irish soldiers believed that their survival in the United States would be under threat following emancipation and the conclusion of the Civil War, when their services would no longer be required as urgently. Thus, the situation in America was probably viewed by Irish soldiers as more serious than the one their countrymen confronted in Italy in 1860. The 1860 war had been fought to protect the temporal power of the Pope. The Irish soldiers had lost, but their religion had survived and still provided one of the pillars of their identity. Across the Atlantic, however, Irish soldiers, and Irish migrants in general, viewed potential equality with blacks as a threat to their survival in America, and they often reacted accordingly by attacking African Americans, both verbally and physically. It was in the wider Irish interest to maintain black slavery, as the Irish believed that freed slaves would migrate north and take jobs previously performed by Irishmen and women, leaving the latter groups, including unemployed former soldiers, unable to support themselves.

As the war progressed, the Irish support for, and loyalty to the cause of, the Union continued to dwindle. In an editorial in The Pilot in May 1863, the writer asked ‘is the Irish spirit still the same?’ The answer was emphatic – ‘Ah, no! no! no! no!'
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It is impossible for it to be […] the Irish spirit for the war is dead! Absolutely dead!’.

The effect of the Emancipation Proclamation on Union Irish commitment had been exacerbated by the March 1863 Draft Act, which had made military service in the Union Army compulsory for those whose names were selected. Also, the Union suffered another devastating defeat at the Battle of Chancellorsville in May 1863. In a speech in Astor House in New York City the following month, Thomas Francis Meagher put forth his argument to ‘let Abolitionism keep within doors, and pray, till it wears its knees out, that the black may be made whiter than snow’. Irish soldier Thomas Galwey emphasised the same belief that African Americans and abolitionists were to blame for the war. He reminisced about a time ‘when yet the jolly carolling of darkies unenvious of liberty was heard in the cottonfield and among the rice plantations’. Clearly, many Irish soldiers blamed the abolitionists for the difficult situation of the Union in the summer of 1863, with the recent invasion by General Robert E. Lee and his Army of Northern Virginia, which had culminated in the Union victory at the Battle of Gettysburg in early July, but had not led to the end of the war.

In the immediate aftermath of Gettysburg, the New York City Draft Riots of July 1863 were viewed as the ultimate Irish disloyalty by many Americans. Lasting four days, and causing death and destruction in the city, the riots exposed the racial and social divides in the Union. At the heart of the events was an explosion of the vicious Irish animosity towards African Americans, resulting at least in part from the Emancipation Proclamation, the Conscription Act, and the rate of casualties among Irish soldiers on the battlefield. Some Irish and Irish American soldiers, such as Thomas Galwey, found themselves in the awkward position of having to enforce the
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rule of law on fellow countrymen and women.Having been sent to New York following the riots, Galwey wrote that ‘the poor, who have to fight in person and not by hired substitutes, look upon us with dislike, at least with suspicion, knowing that we were sent here to enforce the draft, which the riots in July had deferred’.77 This is a rare example of an Irish soldier thinking differently from the prevailing mentality of Irish opinion in the Union, albeit unwillingly. After the riots had run their course, Archbishop John Hughes and other leaders in the Irish-American community steadfastly refused to criticise the Irish Catholic rioters, instead shifting blame onto the authorities and the Union government. This event was taken as a sign of Irish disloyalty by many in America, and it subsequently contributed to a further cooling of Irish enthusiasm for the Union cause.

As the war entered its final year, many Irish soldiers continued to harbour a hatred of both white Protestant Americans and African Americans. This hatred co-existed with a diminishing dedication to the cause of the Union, and a parallel increasing concern for the future efforts required for Irish independence. In May 1864, Thomas Galwey passed black troops in uniform on the train to Washington D.C., and described them as

‘the first negro troops I have ever seen. To these negro troops the feeling of the army is very unfriendly. There are many reasons for this unfriendliness; perhaps the one most often heard among our men is that most of the negro troops represent just so many “loyal” men of Eastern States who eagerly demanded the war, but who preferred to fight by proxy’.78

Here we see another example of the widely-held Irish belief that the American Civil War had been initiated by American Abolitionists and the rich, who were vocal in their opinions but unwilling to risk their lives. It was an accusation repeated by Irish soldiers to white Americans many times throughout the Civil War. Increasingly, many Irish soldiers viewed America not as a free republic where all white men could achieve anything, but instead as a country which had raised the supposedly inferior black race to their level, and where the Irish soldiers themselves were still
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unwelcome, though their lives continued to be sacrificed in conflict. For many Irish soldiers, this justified their declining sense of loyalty to the Union in favour of a resurgent desire to see Ireland free from British influence. Following 1865, therefore, many Union Irish soldiers recrossed the Atlantic, and participated in the 1867 Fenian rebellion.\footnote{On the Fenians and the 1867 rising, see Ramón, A Provisional Dictator; Tom Garvin, Nationalist Revolutionaries in Ireland, 1858-1928, (Dublin, 2005); Fearghal McGarry & James McConnel (eds.), The Black Hand of Republicanism: Fenianism in Modern Ireland, (Dublin, 2009); Niall Whelehan, The Dynamiters: Irish Nationalism and Political Violence in the Wider World, 1867-1900, (Cambridge, 2012); Pádraig Ó Concubhair, ‘The Fenians Were Dreadful Men’: The 1867 Rising, (Cork, 2011)}

James R. Barrett has provided some potentially mitigating reasons for the Union Irish soldiers’ animosity, which was especially virulent towards African Americans. Specifically, he emphasised Irish homogeneity at home, which left many Irish soldiers fearful of other ethnic groups of which they had no experience. In the eyes of many white Americans, however, groups such as the Irish and the African Americans were on a similar level. Barrett has highlighted that the treatment Irish migrants received on their arrival in the United States led to their ghettoization and defensiveness of their own ethnic group at the expense of others. He has written of how similar offensive derogatory terms were applied to each group, such as the “nigger Irish” for Irish migrants and “smoked Irish” for African Americans. As Barrett states, ‘only if they could construct an identity as both Irish and American would they thrive’.\footnote{James R. Barrett, The Irish Way: Becoming American in the Multiethnic City, (New York, 2013), pp. 4-9} Therefore, Irish soldiers began the Civil War emphasising their dedication to the Union, and asserting that Irish military service would prove that they were more worthy of American citizenship than the other ethnic groups in America. As the war progressed, however, Union Irish soldiers realised that their sacrifice made little difference as to how they were perceived in America, as they remained reviled and despised by many in the USA. Thus, in many cases they turned their attention and their sense of ethnic self-identification back across the Atlantic to the country where they had been born, and they instead focused their attentions on what they believed was important to Ireland.
Conclusion

The attitudes of Irish soldiers to other ethnic groups in Italy and in the Union are informative, though in varying ways. For the Irishmen of the Papal Battalion, the unwelcoming reception that they received in Italy in 1860 was an unpleasant surprise. Irish soldiers believed that they would be greeted as protectors of the Papal States by the local residents. Instead, they found themselves vilified and viewed as mercenary interlopers. Subsequently, there was a lack of mutual understanding and many instances of strained relations between the Papal State citizens and the Irish. This was revealed on both sides through verbal abuse, propaganda, and sometimes physical violence. Newspapers in the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia and in Ireland also joined in on their respective sides, attempting to portray the opposition as men of low morals and poor character, motivated by unscrupulous aims. In contrast, one’s own side was usually represented as being of impeccable reputation and temperament. There was little to no effort by either Irish or Italians to find common ground, appreciate the cultural vagaries, or acknowledge the opposition’s motivations.\(^1\) On the Irish side, this mutual contempt led to a simplistic portrayal by many Irish soldiers of both Ireland and the Irish as almost mythically good and ideistically moral, as opposed to the evil and impious Italian enemy, in a similar manner to how Irish soldiers compared themselves to the British. The only exception to this attitude was the relationship between the Irish soldiers and the Catholic clergy of the Papal States, since they shared the same aims and dedication to their spiritual leader.

Furthermore, the ethnic animosity between Irish and Italians also manifested itself in a powerful and growing sense of Irish Catholic nationalism, carried also by the Irish soldiers in the Union army. The Irish dislike of the Piedmontese soldiers and Papal State citizens, coupled with the Irish participation in the Italian movement for national unification, fostered Irish national pride, as their service allowed the establishment of a de facto Irish army. The events of 1860 were an expression of this national sentiment and identity, not just for the Irish soldiers who fought in the Papal Battalion, but also for the Irish people in Ireland who supported the Papal cause. Service in the Papal Army was also viewed by a number of Irish soldiers as a training ground for a future war in Ireland, as the American Civil War was likewise
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seen by a much larger number of patriotic Irish volunteers. The previous support for the absolutist regime of the Papacy, however, put the latter group at odds with many on their arrival in the United States, since, as Republican leader George William Curtis put it, ‘America is a permanent protest against absolutism’. The resulting American nativist prejudice only increased Irish pride and the Irish desire to prove loyal Irish Americans, but also magnified and exacerbated the hatred of African Americans.

The variety of ethnic groups in America by the 1860s forced Irish soldiers to confront the issue of ethnicity and race on a much larger scale than they had ever experienced. The Irishmen who became soldiers in the Union army arrived into a tense and fragmented inter-ethnic situation in North American cities such as New York and Boston. Even those who advocated freedom and tolerance in other areas, such as northern abolitionist Reverend Henry Ward Beecher and inventor Samuel Morse, were quick to denounce what they perceived as the growing Irish Catholic threat to America, and they called for an end to immigration and a Protestant response to this threat. American newspapers described the migrant Irish Catholics as evil, uncivilised and repellent. Irish Catholics were viewed as a general threat to the United States and suffered much racial prejudice and nativist hostility. The Irish were portrayed as lazy illiterate drunks, poverty stricken, simian in appearance, and in thrall to the superstitions of the Catholic Church.

Though there were many reasons why the Irish were despised in America - poverty, appearance, perceived indolence, alcoholism, religion - the ultimate reason was the language of race. Though at that time a relatively recent construct, race was nevertheless a powerful way of distinguishing between those on different rungs of the social ladder. Nativists could therefore describe and portray the Irish as simian
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in appearance in order to define their place in society. This was the same approach adopted by the Union Irish soldiers towards African Americans, and used by Irish soldiers against Piedmontese and Papal State Italians in Italy. Due to their position in the lower echelons of American society, many Irish soldiers in both the Union and the Confederacy were intensely anti-black, and in many cases anti-immigrant, in an attempt to make common cause with white Protestant Americans. During the Civil War, Union Irish soldiers had their loyalties questioned more than once. This was understandable to a certain extent, as both Union and Confederate Irish soldiers often prioritised the needs of Ireland over their respective adopted homelands. As the war continued and Union Irish soldiers saw many of their compatriots killed, their commitment to the Union weakened. The Emancipation Proclamation and the Conscription Act of 1863 compounded the feeling among Union Irish soldiers that they were underappreciated, and possibly considered even lower in society than African Americans.

Union Irish military attitudes to white Protestant Americans were generally similar to those held by the civilian Irish in America. Even before the Civil War, there was disharmony between the Irish and the Americans. Once hostilities commenced, this animosity was reciprocated, especially if the Irish believed their soldiers were being sacrificed to spare American lives. As they had done in Italy, Irish soldiers in the Union Army tried to portray themselves as morally and militarily superior to other ethnicities. Unlike what happened in Italy, however, the Irish soldiers downplayed their Catholicism and emphasised instead their Irish ethnic pride. For the Union Irish soldiers, their Catholicism was more important as a source of succour to men at war, and less as a marker of identity. The ethnic alienation that many Irish subsequently felt in time contributed to a lessening of the Irish dedication to the Union cause and a concomitant strengthening of Irish nationalism amongst many Irish soldiers. Therefore, ethnic interaction helped ensure that Irishmen in the Union Army were eventually more concerned with issues in Ireland rather than in
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America, and felt more loyal to their country of birth than the one they had adopted.\textsuperscript{88}

Ultimately, the ethnic situation in Ireland in the lead up to 1860 was different from that which Irish soldiers later experienced in Italy and in America. The society of which abolitionist and former slave Frederick Douglass spoke positively following his 1847 visit to Ireland was a very homogenous entity, with few people living in the country who were not white and Irish born.\textsuperscript{89} The Irish in Ireland were also not directly threatened by different internal ethnic groups in any way, as their countrymen perceived themselves to be in Italy and in America. Consequently, there was little racial prejudice in Ireland, and any antagonism was more likely sectarian in nature, as it was on occasion with Anglo-Irish or Ulster-Scot Protestants. This contrasted sharply with the situations in Italy and in America. In Italy, the residents of the Papal States and the soldiers of the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia either hurled insults in the direction of Irish soldiers, or threatened their lives and military aims in battle. They did not, however, threaten long term Irish settlement in Italy for the simple reason that that was not the aim of Irish soldiers. Their time in Italy was always intended to be short term, unlike in America. In the Union, instead, the Irish soldiers viewed other ethnic groups, particularly the black population, free or otherwise, as a direct threat to their livelihoods and their survival in their new home. This was due mostly to the possibility that African Americans might take away potential employment from the Irish. Ultimately, these experiences in Italy and in America changed the Irish soldiers’ attitudes from a limited level of tolerance to a much deeper intolerance of the various ethnic groups with whom they came in contact.
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CONCLUSION

This dissertation has examined Irish soldiers in Italy in 1860 and in Civil War America in 1861-1865. Throughout this study, the transnational nature of the Italian _Risorgimento_ and the American Civil War has been at the forefront of the analysis as a contextual framework. There were many parallels between the Civil War and the _Risorgimento_, but most relevant was the fact that both were struggles for national (re)unification, and part of the wider global age of nationalism and nation-building.¹

In this connection, I have examined the development of Irish Catholic nationalism focusing on relatively unknown Irish soldiers serving in Civil War America and _Risorgimento_ Italy. Before they left Ireland, many were imbued with a powerful sense of Irish Catholicism, which was further enhanced by animosity towards Britain. On leaving Ireland, a third motivating factor added to this, a usually negative interaction with other ethnic groups, primarily Italians, African Americans, and white Protestant Americans. The cultural interactions that the Irish soldiers experienced on their travels highlighted the increasing transnational interlinking of European and American societies at mid-nineteenth century. The Irishmen were part of an informal international network of global soldiers, and were both nationalists and internationalists, in that they were Irishmen, but their homeland was part of a wider milieu in which they experienced the world. The Irish soldiers were also part of a social and religious movement which desired the protection and spread of the Catholic faith and supported their Irish homeland. Nineteenth-century ethnic regiments such as the Papal Battalion and the Union Irish Brigade, therefore, can be viewed as outlets for a transnational Irish Catholic nationalism, as well as the nuclei of a future Irish nation through their representation of Ireland on the international stage.²

Following in the footsteps of important recent work such as _Nation/Nazione: Irish Nationalism and the Italian Risorgimento_ (2013), I have rejected the artificial idea that Ireland was historically separate from Europe, instead attempting an assessment of nineteenth-century Irish Catholic nationalism within an Italian
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Further expanding on this argument, I have also addressed Irish Catholic nationalism in its connections with the Union in the American Civil War. Thus, I have attempted to ‘situate the history of the United States in a transoceanic context’, specifically with regard to the phenomenon of Irish Catholic nationalism amongst Union Irish soldiers. Using mobility as a framework, I firstly assessed how the experiences of specific Irish soldiers, who served in both Italy and in America, were revealing and informative with regard to topics such as Irish nationalism and migration, Irish service in foreign armies, Irish attitudes to Garibaldi, and the role of the Irish in the wider mid-nineteenth century world. Following this, I examined the influence of Catholicism, anti-British feeling, and ethnic interaction in the lives of Irish soldiers who served in either Italy or in America, in order to further highlight the transnational nature of Irish Catholic nationalism and nation-building.

The first of the motivating themes that influenced Irish soldiers outside of Ireland was Catholicism. An analysis of their writings clearly allows us an increased understanding of the strong Catholic ethos of Irish soldiers, both those who served in the Papal Battalion and those in the Union Army. Motivated young Irishmen with an intense sense of Roman Catholicism risked their lives serving foreign leaders during the first half of the 1860s. A belief that they were proving their loyalty to their Catholic God and to their spiritual leaders in both regions left the Irish soldiers often unable or unwilling to appreciate the contrasting views and political aims of their enemies in Italy and in America. This was particularly true in Italy, due to the significance of the Pope’s temporal power, and his ability to influence political events. This failure to fully grasp the implications of their aims, in opposition to the wider aspirations of their opponents, left the Irish soldiers open to understandable, yet sometimes unfair, accusations of hypocrisy. Ultimately, however, the Papal Battalion and Union Irish soldiers both expressed the same desire to express their
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Irish Catholic identity, driven not by material gain but by a higher ideal of religious loyalty and service.

Furthermore, despite the Irish soldiers’ nominal status as British subjects, a bitterness towards Britain was carried by the Irishmen in the Papal Battalion in 1860 and in the Union Army in 1861-1865. Though longstanding over many centuries, this sentiment had been given further impetus due to events in Ireland during the nineteenth-century, especially the Great Irish Famine, which left many Irish feeling that the British government viewed them as second class citizens. The situation was further complicated by the fact that, not only was there tension between the Irish and the British, but also between Irish Catholic and Irish Protestant in Ireland. The minority Protestant population had controlled Ireland over the Catholic majority for hundreds of years, understandably leaving a legacy of anger and resentment amongst the latter grouping. Attempts by evangelical Protestants to proselytise in Ireland (and in Italy) added to the tension between Irish Catholic and Irish Protestant. Irish soldiers in Italy and in the Union army were influenced by this, and they expounded on the ingrained rancour and abhorrence they held for the British, and for Protestants everywhere, in their letters. The quotes from these soldiers assist us in understanding why this enmity towards Britain was so forceful, and how it influenced their motivations, particularly in America and, to a lesser extent, in Italy.

Finally, the Irish soldiers went from an ethnically homogeneous society in Ireland to a confrontational situation with citizens of the Papal States and Piedmontese soldiers in Italy. Union Irish soldiers also clashed with African Americans and white Protestant Americans. This led to gradually changing attitudes amongst Irish soldiers, from early tolerance, to increasing antagonism, to outright hatred towards others in some cases. There were exceptions where Irish soldiers and other groups co-existed peacefully in both Italy and in America, but these were few. In Italy in 1860, the negative ethnic interactions went hand in hand with growing levels of Irish pride and patriotism, allied to a sense of moral and military superiority that developed amongst Irish soldiers often as a response to the ethnic prejudice that many of them endured. In America, the Union Irish soldiers were subjected to
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accusations of disloyalty and of being supporters of slavery. Irish soldiers, thus, reacted by emphasising their loyalty for the Union and their extreme bravery when fighting, even claiming to be superior fighters to all other ethnic groups, as their peers had done in Italy. Gradually, though, the Union Irish soldiers became more and more disillusioned, and their thoughts and sense of duty began to turn towards their old home across the Atlantic. Unlike the Irishmen who served in Italy, however, the focus for Irish soldiers in America was almost always on Irish ethnic pride rather than on religion. In other words, Union Irish soldiers were motivated primarily by a desire to prove that Irishmen were as brave as other ethnicities in the Union Army, including white Americans, African Americans, and indeed the British, rather than by a wish to protect the Catholic Church and its spiritual leader from perceived internal or external threats, as had been the case in Italy.

In this connection, the growth of the Irish Republican Brotherhood (Fenians) in the North American Irish community had been aided by a desire to use the military experience acquired serving the Pope and the Union against the British. Following the Civil War, many Union Irish soldiers returned to Ireland in the hope of assisting any attempted rebellion. The IRB had been founded on both sides of the Atlantic before the Civil War began, but had grown in strength during the early 1860s, further enhanced by Irish military endeavours abroad. A powerful sense of Irish Catholic nationalism combined with anti-Britishness was a central pillar of the movement’s ethos. The movement had as its central motivation ‘the view of England as a satanic power upon earth, a mystic commitment to Ireland, and a belief that an independent Irish republic, ‘virtually’ established in the hearts of men, possessed a superior moral authority’. C.A. Bayly has viewed transnational Fenianism as another reform movement which influenced, and was influenced by, other movements on both sides of the Atlantic. These movements included Abolitionism, Chartism, and the 1848 Revolutions, which ‘all concerned the right of the individual as a citizen’. In this connection, the Irish soldiers who became Fenians were transatlantic proponents of reform, activists bringing ideas of freedom and
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The papers of Thomas William Sweeny reveal much about ongoing communication regarding the Fenian Brotherhood in both the USA and Ireland immediately following the American Civil War. A number of former Union Army soldiers and generals, such as C. Carroll Tevis and Sweeny himself, were involved with the Fenian movement. Much of this correspondence spoke of the cause and independence of the Irish nation. There was even support for the Fenian Brotherhood amongst ordinary American citizens. For example, Mary Phelps, writing in 1866, was sympathetic to Sweeny after his dismissal from the US Army, which possibly was caused by his membership of the Fenian Brotherhood. Phelps asserted that ‘although I am an American, my heart and prayers are with the Fenian movement. I hope to see or hear of Ireland being a free and independent government. She has submitted long enough to the tyranny of England’. Phelps continued by saying that ‘the Irish have been great and noble soldiers in the great rebellion, and I see no reason why if they will brave so many dangers for their adopted country, why they should not brave all dangers for their native land’.  

Letters such as this highlight the fact that there was a certain level of support for Irish independence in the United States at this time, perhaps due in part to perceived British sympathy for the Confederate States during the American Civil War.

Throughout the 1860s, the sectarian divide in Ireland intensified, as a significant level of anti-Irish Catholic feeling existed in Britain and amongst Irish Protestants in Ireland. Evidence of this sentiment in the highest echelons of power in Britain was provided by an unsavoury incident in 1868 involving Benjamin Disraeli. The British Prime Minister was addressing his constituents at a meeting reported by *The Flag of Ireland* and *The Times*. Discussing the Great Irish Famine, Disraeli spoke favourably of this event which had cost so many Irish lives. He felt that it had led to a social revolution unlike any that had ever happened in any other
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country in the world. The population of Ireland per square mile, previously greater than in any European country and indeed many countries outside Europe, underwent a dramatic downward adjustment. A member of the audience then shouted ‘three cheers for the Famine’, to which Disraeli replied ‘well, well, you have given three cheers for things before this that have not done so much good as the Famine’. Remarks such as these assisted the Fenian movement, and enhanced the feeling amongst many Irish people that, though they were technically part of the United Kingdom, in reality they were viewed as an inferior minority. The bitterness towards Britain that episodes such as the previous one engendered was transnational in nature, as evidenced by its role as a motivating factor for the Irish soldiers who fought in Italy in 1860 and in America in 1861-1865.

For their part, the Fenians were quite willing to use the Irish soldiers’ military experience to achieve their aims. Their version of Irish nationalism rejected the constitutional politics practiced by Daniel O’Connell in the first half of the nineteenth-century, promoting instead a commitment to separatist violence. Fearghal McGarry and James McConnel, amongst others, have defined the main difference between the two varieties of Irish nationalism as the distinction between the objective of a separatist Irish republic completely disengaged from Britain, or the objective of Irish self-government within the union with Britain through a parliament in Dublin, such as that later espoused by the Home Rule Party. The Fenians helped to shift the focus of mainstream Irish nationalism from a constitutional non-violent one to a more violent and aggressively sectarian version. The shift in focus for Union Irish soldiers from America to Ireland in the later stages of the American Civil War emphasised the transnational nature of violent and sectarian Irish Catholic nationalism, and also the influence of the ongoing impact of the animosity towards Britain in Ireland, Italy and America.

Ultimately, Irish soldiers in the Papal Battalion and especially in the Union army played an important role in creating a more violent version of Irish Catholic nationalism, particularly through their use of military training on Irish soil from 1865, but also by emphasising the Catholic nature of Irish nationalism at mid-

nineteenth century, and beyond. In this connection, Tom Garvin has written that ‘there was nothing spontaneous about the Irish revolution; it was created by the strenuous efforts of many activists over two generations’. Furthermore, Roy Foster has highlighted the isolation of the revolutionary generation (1913-23) from the preceding generation, asserting that many of them considered that their elders had ‘sold the pass to craven constitutionalism, by deciding that the Fenian agenda of achieving separation from Britain through physical force was outmoded, and opting for parliamentary agitation’. Instead, the younger generation, many of whom fought in the 1916 Rising and subsequent events, were inspired by an earlier tradition of revolutionary secret societies, doomed futile rebellions, and commemorations of Irish Fenian martyrs, such as those executed following the attack on a prison van in Manchester in 1867.18

Thus, the Fenian legacy had bypassed the generation which had supported the Home Rule movement, and now motivated the future revolutionaries of 1916 and beyond. D. George Boyce stretches this point further, asserting that Fenianism was ‘a connecting link that bound together the 1798 rebellion, the Young Ireland revolutionary gesture of 1848, and, in the future, 1916’.19 Many of those who fought in the 1916 Rising and subsequent events, therefore, were inspired by an earlier tradition of Fenianism, failed yet romantic notions of rebellion, and commemorations of Irish martyrs. If this is accurate, the Irish soldiers at the heart of this study were part of a process which led to the revolutionary generation (1913-23) – a generation that took inspiration from men of action, epitomised by the 1860 Papal Battalion and the 1861-65 Union Irish soldiers, and not from the non-violent constitutional nationalism of the late nineteenth-century Home Rule era. Though a small yet influential part of this process, their impact could still be felt in more recent times, specifically in the linkage of revolutionary violence, Catholic nationalism, and martyrdom – an ideological combination exemplified, at least in theory, by many members of the Irish Republican Army (IRA) during Northern Ireland’s 1969-1998 ‘Troubles’. The origins of this mentality stretch all the way back to the early

nineteenth-century, but it was epitomised by the religiously motivated young Irishmen who served in Italy and the USA in the 1860s.\textsuperscript{20}
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