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Knowing That United States Could Call Civil War Veterans, France Withdrew Army and Left Maximilian to His Fate
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are as presented so enormously unjust as to be totally incapable as to the amounts claimed. The treaty with Spain, made by General Almonte, is said to be an outrageous fraud, but I know nothing of the facts except from a report too vague to be relied upon.

A disagreement between the allied representatives as to the interpretation of a clause in the treaty, proved acceptable to Mexico. On April 16, 1862, the French representatives issued a proclamation to the people of Mexico, which amounted virtually to a declaration of war against that country, but Juarez refused to regard it so. Mr. Martin says:

The most powerful stimulant was his firm belief in the counteracting influence of the United States. The jealousy with which the action of the powers was viewed across the border, the character of the diplomatic correspondence which had passed—and week by week was passing—between the accredited representatives at Washington and Paris were perfectly well known to this vigilant and well-informed President.

But by the beginning of May, 1862, the rupture between the French and Mexican Governments was complete, and hostilities were in full swing. Archduke Maximilian, brother to the Emperor of Austria, and Carlotta, his wife, started for Mexico on April 14, 1864, having been prevailed upon by Napoleon III. to accept the Crown of Mexico. They arrived at Vera Cruz on May 28. They entered Mexico City in triumph. No cloud appeared at this time to be looming anywhere near the horizon. But Maximilian's monetary troubles began upon the day that he landed at Vera Cruz, and they did not leave him during the course of his reign.

At the end of 1864 the French intervention had resulted in the nominal winning over, by force, of only a part of the nation to the imperial cause. On Oct. 3, 1865, Maximilian committed the worst blunder and most unpardonable act of his short but troublesome reign—the premeditation of the "Black Decree," the terms of which placed beyond the law all Mexicans who were found bearing arms against the monarchy, and who declined to lay them down. At the end of the year the Mexican Treasury was in a very poor condition.

When the funds were at their lowest

the French Minister for Foreign Affairs considered it advisable to düm the Mexican Government for overdue interest and repayment in part of the principal. Maximilian dispatched an Ambassador to Paris, and received a preemptory and most insolent reply to his letter addressed to Napoleon, intimating that "Maximilian had acted dishonorably." This letter ended with the staggering announcement that the French Emperor had decided to withdraw his troops altogether from Mexico, having come to the sudden conclusion that "prolonged foreign protection is a bad school, and a source of perils; in domestic matters it habituates people not to reckon on themselves, and paralyzes the national activity."

Maximilian and his wife had exhausted their private fortunes. In the Spring of 1866, Carlotta left Mexico City upon her return to Europe. After fruitless efforts to obtain justice for her consort, including a personal appeal to the Pope, she became insane, and has remained so until the present day. Maximilian was betrayed and found himself a prisoner in the hands of a horde of troops thirsting for revenge. He was tried by court-martial and shot on June 19, 1867.

The American Secretary of State was at least consistent in his sympathies, and at no time did anything, or permitted anything to be done, which could possibly assist Maximilian in his efforts to establish his monarchy upon a firm and permanent basis. Mr. Martin says:

One reason for Mr. Seward's antagonism was his belief that, during his visit to Paris, Maximilian had suggested to Napoleon III. the advisability of his acknowledging the Confederates in their secession from the Union.

William L. Dayton, Lincoln's first Minister to France, rather seems to have exceeded the usual diplomatic latitude by venturing to "advise" the Secretary of State as to his future policy with regard to Mexico. He tells Mr. Seward, for instance, on April 7, 1864, that "any action at present by the United States would be sure to embroil us with France," adding "we cannot, under existing circumstances, afford a war with France for the quixotic purpose of helping Mexico."

Mr. Seward, seemingly, approved cordially of the sentiments expressed, for at a later date, March 17, 1865, he wrote to Mr. Bigelow, who succeeded Mr. Dayton: "This Government has not interfered, does not propose to interfere. • • • It firmly repels foreign intervention here, and looks with disfavor upon it anywhere. Therefore, for us to intervene in Mexico would be only to reverse our own principles, and not to adopt in regard to that country the very policy which in any case we disallow."

"Mr. Bigelow, however, went even further than his predecessor," asserts Mr. Martin, "in laying down the policy of the United States, and upon one occasion at least he seems to have provoked a mild kind of reprimand from the Secretary of State."

The Bigelow statement occasioned great satisfaction to the French Government, since it entirely put aside any intention of this country to object further should the monarchy in Mexico prove successful. Mr. Bigelow was informed, however, by Mr. Seward, in a dispatch dated June 30, 1865: "It is thought that the argument which you have recited is not warranted by the instructions of this department. It will be well, at your convenience, to make this explanation to Mr. Drouyn de l'Huys. So far as our relations are concerned, what we hold in regard to Mexico is that France is a belligerent there, in war with the Republic of Mexico. We do not enter into the merits of the belligerents but we practice in regard to the contest the principles of neutrality; and we have insisted upon the practice of neutrality by all nations with regard to our civil war."

Mr. Seward concluded by assuring Mr. Bigelow that "he attached no importance to this matter."
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