

#### IV. EXCOMMUNICATED

DR. McGLYNN had received four summonses to go to Rome, the last of which came from Pope Leo himself and set a time limit of forty days for his appearance at the Vatican under penalty of excommunication if he failed to appear. He not only had not gone, but he had offered no excuse for not going, other than a denial of the right of his Archbishop or other ecclesiastical superiors to order him to Rome to answer unspecified charges connected with his exercise of the rights of an American citizen. He had not even tried to secure an "unequivocal expression of opinion by Catholics" regarding the matter, as urged by Henry George. Why he declined to take this latter course has never been adequately explained, either by the Doctor or by anyone else. Feeling as he did that it was useless for him to go to Rome as a suspended priest with any chance of success against his powerful opponents, he probably felt that it was equally useless to attempt to secure the needed expression of Catholic opinion with his Archbishop and all the powerful and wealthy elements of the Church in New York arrayed against him; also, that if he tried to do this, it would be misconstrued as an attempt to split the Church asunder.

Though there were many prominent Catholics who contemplated such a split with complacency, and even

#### 136 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

avored it under the circumstances existing, he turned away from all such suggestions. For him there was but one Church, and to it he belonged, regardless of what his bishop, the Propaganda or even the Pope himself might say about it. A perusal of his speeches which are extant and authentic fails to reveal a word or sentence indicating that he had the slightest thought of disrupting the Church. However bitterly he might arraign the men who were in temporary possession of the dignities, emoluments and authority of the "ecclesiastical machine," he held steadily the ideal of the Church Eternal founded by Jesus Christ which could do no wrong, even though small and even bad men might misrepresent it and make it appear wrong.

To most of his Catholic and practically all his non-Catholic friends this line of reasoning seemed casuistic and had small appeal. To them the Church was what its members, its priests and its higher officials made it. These could by their conduct make it shine with glory or cover it with shame, and they felt that the persecution and final excommunication of Dr. McGlynn had covered it with shame. Thus the Church was divided despite his desire to prevent a split.

The division in the Church which had followed his suspension and deposition from the pastorate of St. Stephen's was mild and tame as compared with that which followed his excommunication. Until the ban was actually promulgated, many Catholics did not believe such a thing could really happen, and these were dumbfounded, shocked and scandalized. Letters by the thousands poured into the offices of the *Standard* 'I. and other papers and periodicals, written by Catholics

## 137 / EXCOMMUNICATED

of high and low degree, some commending the ban but most of them condemning it. Criticisms of the Archbishop ranged from sorrowful protests against his abuse of his ecclesiastical authority to indignant denunciations and denials that he had any authority in the matter. With scarcely a dissenting voice these blamed the Archbishop and his associates, Mgr. Preston and Bishops McQuaid and Gilmour, and Cardinal Simeoni in Rome, for instigating the trouble and deceiving the Holy Father.

Now again legions of communicants of the Church, appreciating the worth of the good priest, decided that if the Doctor were not a good Catholic they could not be, and left the Church, many never to set foot in a Catholic church again until his restoration, and some forever. Among those who remained there was noted a sad letting down of religious morale. Years later one of these, questioned about the matter, confessed that, while he had felt obliged to stand by the Archbishop after the thunderbolt of excommunication had fallen, "I never again had any real reverence for either the Archbishop or the Pope."

And yet he had in his poor way only followed the advice which Dr. McGlynn himself had given from a full heart to his followers, *not* to leave the Church on his account "lest they thereby imperil their immortal souls."

Blistering as were some of the letters addressed to the press by Catholics as well as Protestants, even by Catholic priests, which were published, there were others still more bitter which were consigned to editorial wastebaskets. Most of the Catholic laymen had

## 138 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

no compunction against signing their full names to their letters, though the priests usually withheld their names, for obvious reasons.

But the friends of the Archbishop, while fewer in number, were by no means inarticulate. Interviewed by a *Tribune* reporter, Vicar-General Preston expressed his views as follows:

Dr. McGlynn has been excommunicated, not for holding certain political opinions contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church, nor for any political actions that he has committed, but for disobeying the positive command of the Sovereign Pontiff summoning him to Rome.

This despite the statement by Archbishop Corrigan in one of his letters that, if the Doctor had retracted his land doctrine, no cause for censure would have remained.

Asked by the reporter if the Doctor had not the right to demand of the Archbishop the right of trial here, Mgr. Preston replied:

No, because his case was taken to Rome and must be settled there. Can he appeal to Rome? He can go there as a suppliant for forgiveness when he has changed his course. When he has done this he will be pardoned and doubtless reinstated, but not in St. Stephen's. He has caused too much scandal to the Church here to allow that to be done. But until he submits, the action of the Pope is final. There is no appeal from it. To say that the Pope has violated the canon law in the matter is nonsense. Why, the Holy See is above canon law, though of course he does not act

contrary to it. He is the supreme court. His decision is final.

This was the same Mgr. Preston who in January had declared in an interview published by the *Tribune*:

#### 139 / EXCOMMUNICATED

“Dr. McGlynn has been suspended because he holds doctrines as to ownership of land which are contrary to the teachings of the Church.”

The *Catholic Herald* had then rebuked him thus:

Hold hard right there, Vicar-General. Somehow we have an idea that the Church of Ireland is within the borders of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church. Well, the Archbishop of Cashel has just written a letter in which he says the land of Ireland belongs to the people of Ireland. If this be true, can it be un-Catholic to assert the same of the land of France, of England, of America?

It is on this statement of Mgr. Preston that Dr. McGlynn was excommunicated, not for his belief in and advocacy of the Georgean land doctrine, nor for his public advocacy of Henry George's election as Mayor of New York in defiance of his Bishop's order, but for disobeying the order of the Pope to come to Rome, that defense of the excommunication must rest. Friends of the Archbishop immediately seized upon Mgr. Preston's statement as embodying the true reason therefor. The *New York Tribune*, while arguing that the Doctor had “himself made it impossible to know what position the Church would take on that doctrine by refusing to submit to its lawful mandates,” and that “he put himself out of court by refusing to submit to its jurisdiction,” went on to say:

The parties are hopelessly at odds as to the most elemental facts in the situation. There is no point of contact between the position he assumes and that held by his Church. The Church says it is not a question of doctrine, but one of discipline. Dr. McGlynn says it is not a question

#### 140 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

of discipline, but one of doctrine. How this dispute is to be adjusted no one seems to have any idea, but it is possible that the Church may find it necessary to make public a full and clear statement showing precisely how Dr. McGlynn has entailed excommunication upon himself. Such an authoritative and conclusive statement indeed may be the only method of determining a matter which is becoming more scandalous continually from the point of view of the Church of Rome.

Friends of the Archbishop and enemies of the priest found it convenient to forget what should not be forgotten—that the order that Dr. McGlynn come to Rome was coupled with the requirement that he recant the Georgean land doctrine, and that this land doctrine was itself the reason why he was summoned to Rome. Only by the most transparent casuistry can the truth be obscured that Dr. McGlynn's real “contumacy” consisted in his refusal to recant the land doctrine that was so obnoxious to Archbishop Corrigan and Cardinal Simeoni.

But friends of the *Soggarth Aroon* would not allow them to forget this truth, and the very next day the *Tribune* felt obliged to print the following letter, signed “Catholic”:

A simple answer to your elaborate editorial in today’s *Tribune* is that Dr. McGlynn was directed first to retract the land doctrine that he held, then to come to Rome to be condemned, and then allowed to go and excommunicate himself.

Though they were not numerous, there yet were Protestant clergymen who publicly voiced their approval

#### 141 / EXCOMMUNICATED

and support of Dr. McGlynn both before and after his excommunication. The Rev. L. H. King of the Forty-Seventh Street Methodist Episcopal Church, New York, preached a sermon on July 17 in which, after criticising various dogmas peculiar to the Church of Rome, he said, according to the *Tribune*:

I believe every one of the original doctrines of the Roman Church as Dr. McGlynn states them, and I wish they could form a great Catholic Church on this continent and have him as Pope. I would join it if the Methodist Church should fall by the way . . . While they curse him thus, in the name of the Methodists of this country I bless him. If there is no other pulpit that wants him, I will invite him to come here to preach. If there is no other church to give him communion, I will welcome him to mine. In the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, whom he loves and whom I love, I welcome him to my heart. May God bless all such men and multiply them.

The Rev. Martyn Summerbell of St. Paul’s Evangelical Church, 250 West Thirty-fourth Street, uttered similar sentiments and opined that, after what had taken place, “the Catholic Church in America can never again become what it was before.”

Another notable sermon was that by Dr. Howard Henderson of the Sixty-First Street Methodist Episcopal Church on July 24 on the subject “Father McGlynn, the Patriot Priest,” in which, after a sketchy presentation of the claims of the Pope to temporal power, he was reported by the *Tribune* as saying:

I am not saying anything in favor of Mr. George’s theory, but only trying to show that Dr. McGlynn has the right

#### 142 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

to hold any opinion on political economy he may choose. The only way to defeat an error is to prove that it is not true. Mr. George may not have found the panacea for, all ills and Dr. McGlynn may not be the hermit of a new crusade. But they have placed themselves upon the altar of self-sacrifice and I will listen to them.

That Dr. McGlynn should stand by this doctrine even against excommunication from his Church should make every man hesitate before he condemns what he has not studied. If Dr. McGlynn would retract he might be made a bishop. He is acknowledged to be the St. Chrysostom of America and is the peer of any man on

the lecture platform. He is the first martyr to Papal power in America. His excommunication is an assault upon the doctrine of American citizenship, upon the liberty of opinion, speech and action, and when we uphold him, we but fortify our position as American citizens. Dr. McGlynn is the center of the age and a monitor of the future.

There were enough such sermons by Protestant clergymen to arouse interesting speculations as to what a Pope of Dr. McGlynn's character might do toward the reuniting of Christendom in a truly universal church. It was a truly *know-nothing* element of American Protestantism that could bring itself to applaud the excommunication of a priest who showed such American independence of dictation from Rome, and how it did so is a mystery past solving.

A Rev. Charles P. McCarthy, an English clergyman then in this country, is recorded as saying:

Truth will march triumphantly over the debris of ecclesiastical machines, whether Protestant or Catholic, for its Author is no more a respecter of churches than He is of

#### 143 / EXCOMMUNICATED

persons. The Lamb of God was not slain to save ecclesiastical organizations.

Mr. A. J. Steers was the chairman at the meeting of the Anti-Poverty Society on July 24. He introduced himself, to the merriment of the audience, as "the overweeningly ambitious and wealthy Irish widow who has led Dr. McGlynn from the path of rectitude by giving him a copy of *Progress and Poverty* to read."

So many questions and surmises about Dr. McGlynn's future course had been discussed in the press that the Doctor devoted a part of the address to answering them, question-and-answer style, reported by the New York *Tribune* as follows:

What then are we to do?

I intend to keep on doing just what I have been doing.

What would you have us do?

I would advise you to keep on doing just what you have been doing. I stated in a letter last December that I should teach a doctrine opposing the oppression of the poor and against the right of private property in land, and I shall so continue to teach. Nothing that I know of has happened since to make me change my course. The record shows that five years ago I was censured for preaching a doctrine on Land League platforms which the leader of the machine said was opposed to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and yet they acknowledged that they had not read the doctrine. It is in the public record of the Archbishop that, if I had only retracted the doctrine which I had expressed in a conversation with a *Tribune* reporter, all would have been forgiven.

How about your ceasing to be a priest and becoming a mere politician?

#### 144 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

I have not ceased to be a priest and I am never going to be a mere politician.

Was it a mistake on your part to preach politics in the pulpit?

I never did preach politics in the pulpit. After hearing confession Saturday night, and preaching seven, eight, nine or ten sermons every Sunday, then on Monday evening, just for recreation, instead of going off and drinking punch, or playing cards, I went once to Chickering Hall and once came here and said a few words for the benefit of the suffering poor. That is all. I am going on just as I have been going, like the stars that “shine because they have nothing else to do.” I was a preacher out of a job, and so I had nothing else to do but talk, as I am doing now, and I am going to continue it as long as I can.

How about the excommunication: Are you going to start another church?

Of course not.

What do you advise us to do—to leave the Catholic Church?

What do you take me for? Do you think I preached the doctrines I have all my life for what I was paid for it? I have no quarrel with the doctrines of the Catholic Church or with its sacraments, and I beseech all those who at present enjoy these doctrines and sacraments to continue to enjoy them as at present I do not. So I would teach you to discriminate between the doctrine of the Catholic Church and the abuses of the ecclesiastical machine, which is frequently the worst obstacle in the way of achievement of true liberty. As far as possible continue to enjoy the sacraments. But never sacrifice one tittle of your individual liberty to such a machine. If a priest at confession asks you if you attend the meetings of the Anti-Poverty Society, and on your answering yes, says “Then I can’t give you abso-

#### 145 / EXCOMMUNICATED

lution,” then say to him: “Rev. Father, you can keep your absolution.” Any absolution to be of any practical good must come from God. When you are deprived of that absolution from any such cause you can go with a clear conscience to God himself for absolution.

But further—if they should finally excommunicate us, what shall we do then?

Well, I’ll tell you that when the time comes.

The August, 1887, issue of the *North American Review* contained an article by Dr. McGlynn under the caption “The New Know-Nothingism and the Old,” which received practically unanimous endorsement, except in that portion of the Catholic press which supported the Archbishop. Perhaps one reason for this uniform commendation was that it contained not a word about Henry George or the land question. In it he endeavored to show how little cause for anxiety or action or even for existence the Know-Nothing party of former days really had, whereas there was now great reason for patriotic Americans to become alarmed about the future of the country’s efforts to keep free the political opinions and actions of its members. He was fearful, too, that the general establishment of parochial schools would now encourage and develop a sectarian cleavage among the people, on the one hand, and an ecclesiastical control of politico-economic opinion, on the other, that boded ill for the future.

A significant paragraph in this article called attention to the fact that the strongest protest against the claim of Rome to control the politics of its priests came from Catholics themselves.

Few priests would comment on the ‘article for publi-

## 146 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

cation, and the Catholic press for the most part ignored or minimized it, but Catholic laymen of prominence were outspoken in praise of it. Mr. O'Loughlin, whose *Catholic Herald* had been forced to suspend publication by Archbishop Corrigan's condemnation, said in the *Standard*:

**It** is a ringing article, and very timely. I say this though **I** am a Catholic, but **I** am one who does not forget that **I** am also an American citizen. No citizen of the United States worthy of the name can fail to be impressed with what the Doctor states. He knows what he is talking about and every man at all familiar with the subjects touched upon knows that his statements and conclusions rest upon the best foundation.

This topic, "The New Know-Nothingism and the Old," was also the theme of the Doctor's address in the Brooklyn Opera House on July 31. The great theatre was filled to capacity, and the Brooklyn *Eagle* commented on the presence of large numbers of Catholic laymen of prominence and a number of Catholic priests, mentioning the hearty applause that greeted the Doctor's "points" against the New York Catholic régime.

Those Protestants who saw in Dr. McGlynn's excommunication for his defense of the political rights of American priests an opportunity for renewed and stronger attacks on the Catholic Church as an institution inimical to American liberty got small comfort from the Doctor, however. He maintained the attitude of an orthodox Catholic despite his excommunication, reserving all his ammunition for those who were misusing their ecclesiastical power. The authorities of the

## 147 / EXCOMMUNICATED

Church, in the meantime, seemed bent on confirming the most extreme fears of the "Know-Nothings," doing to it more damage than the most rabid anti-papists ever dreamed of doing.

### A LIBERAL RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

One man who had known Dr. McGlynn well, and whom I questioned about his life while under the ban of excommunication, said substantially:

**It** is impossible to do justice to that wonderful man. **I** was more or less closely associated with him during most of that period, and **I** cannot. As for myself, it was the happiest, scrappiest time of my life, and so, **I** believe, it was for him. **With** his excommunication came a freedom which he had not experienced before, and he preached as he never had preached before.

Certainly it was a liberal education in Catholicism, the true Catholicism that has been overlaid and obscured to a large degree by the very forms and ceremonies that have been devised as aids in worship and the living of a religious life, that the Doctor now began to lay before the people, and which was gratefully absorbed by those who were mentally and spiritually qualified to receive it. True, there were

those who by reason of narrow-mindedness were not so qualified, and there can be no doubt that considerable numbers were repelled by his cavalier treatment of these forms and ceremonies, which, however useful they may be in directing and holding the attention and devotion of congregations and individuals, are not the real objects of veneration, since in their absence it is still possible

#### 148 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

to worship God in spirit and in truth. Was it not because of this weakness of many human minds that one of the Ten Commandments was against the making of graven images?

To Dr. McGlynn, theology was precisely what the etymology of the word indicated—the law of God. The economic relations of mankind, clearly, were subject to the law of God, so that theology and economics, governing as they did the relations of men and nations, were almost synonymous terms. In his view, the subjecting of theology and economics alike to man's law was the source of practically all the evils in the world—it was as clear to him as the sun at noon on a cloudless day that, as St. Paul said, “the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.”

Anathema to him also was the notion (evolved from the revelation that God, while just, is also merciful) that man, individually or collectively, can be saved from the consequences of sin while he continues sinning. He considered this the supreme folly ever conceived by man, and certainly not of divine origin. Of course no church, Catholic or other, has ever expressly taught this folly, yet many people of all denominations seem possessed of this idea to greater or less degree. The good Doctor sought to extirpate it utterly. The world must reform its ways in order to be saved.

The Catholic Church rightly stresses the importance of religious education being imparted to the young along with education in the material and secular affairs of life. As do other religious organizations, however, it omits what may be regarded as the very cornerstone of all real religious instruction by failing to set forth con-

#### 149 / EXCOMMUNICATED

vincingly the perfection of the universe and all that it contains as God created it. The unity of the universe, the exquisite harmony and balance of all its workings, are objects to be studied and examples to be emulated and approximated in all human relationships, even though we, being finite, cannot hope to equal infinity in perfection.

It was this omission which Dr. McGlynn sought to remedy by pointing out that God has placed us on and given us dominion over a planet of surpassing richness and beauty, capable, under a régime of justice, of sustaining and ministering to both the material and spiritual needs of vastly greater populations than have yet peopled it, and that, if there be found among us want and misery and crime, it must be because we have misused the wondrous gift which He has bestowed upon us. It was here that he submitted the proposition that it could never have been the design of God that we should turn his magnificent planet, so necessary for all, either in whole or in part, to be the enduring personal private property of a few of its inhabitants, that they might extort tribute from their fellows for the privilege of



living, working and doing business on it; that, in fact, one of the most mandatory laws given to Moses on Sinai was that set forth in the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus, twenty-third verse: “The land shall not be sold in perpetuity, for the land is mine, for ye are strangers and sojourners with me.” Instead, no land was to be sold beyond the year of jubilee, which came every fifty years, when there should be practically a redivision of the land for the new generation: “Ye shall proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants

## 150 / REBELI PRIEST AND PROPHET

thereof; and ye shall return every man unto his possession; and ye shall return every man unto his family.” This, he pointed out, was the Mosaic method of preventing the growth in Israel of a landless proletariat with no rights in the land of their birth.

He delighted in reciting God’s promise of peace, security, prosperity and happiness as the natural rewards of obedience to the law; and he pointed out how the history of Israel was a Long-continued fulfillment of the prophesied penalties of disobedience. Carrying the history of Israel and its forgotten law down to the time of Solomon, who in the wisdom of his youth revived the law and put it into effect, he asserted that there was nothing mysterious about the unprecedented prosperity and grandeur which the nation attained. It was but the natural consequence of obedience to a divinely ordained law, even as the distress into which the nation fell when Solomon in his dotage forgot the law was likewise but a natural and inevitable consequence of disobedience.

He loved especially the first few verses of the fifth chapter of Isaiah, which he sometimes called “*Progress and Poverty* in miniature.” In it Isaiah tells in beautiful Eastern imagery of what God has done for Israel, what He expected of Israel, and especially of Judah, and what He got: “And he Looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for justice, but behold a cry. Woe unto them that join house to house and lay field to field till there be no place!” Then he asked:

“Could condemnation of the forestalling and monopolizing of land for profit be condemned more emphatically?”

## 151 / EXCOMMUNICATED

And he quoted the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v, 17-18) as a definite and devastating answer to those who asserted that Jesus had swept away the “Old Dispensation” when He established His new one.

His delight in quoting Scripture in support of his proposition that “the earth is God’s table which He has set for all His children—and He has no stepchildren” was boundless. Again and again would he recite with peculiar emphasis to various audiences a portion of the sixty-fifth chapter of Isaiah where the prophet describes the New Jerusalem which God would establish when man had learned to obey His law:

They shall build houses *and inhabit them*; they shall plant vineyards *and eat the fruit of them*. They shall not build and *another* inhabit; they shall not plant and *another* eat. They shall not labor in vain, nor bring forth for trouble.

Another oft-repeated thought was that God, who had laid on man the obligation to live by labor, had not neglected to provide a place where he *could* labor, which had been taken from him.

In commenting on the Pope's decision not to condemn the Knights of Labor, Dr. McGlynn had drawn a fine distinction between the Church and the Kingdom of Heaven that probably shocked those who regarded them as identical, the *Standard* reporting him as saying:

It is fortunate that a man in his position understands that the drift of the times is toward democracy and that the Church must recognize this democratic spirit if she is to make any gains in her great work of spreading the gospel of the Kingdom of Peace, which is, after all, her *raison*

## 152 / REBEL,. PRIEST AND PROPHET

*d'être*. The spiritual welfare of men is the end of her existence, and ecclesiastical authority and dogma are but means to attain this, or, to use a figure, they are but the scaffolding for the erection of the spiritual edifice, and in the eternal Kingdom of God, after having served its purpose, this scaffolding will disappear, but love will endure forever.

No less clear was the distinction which he constantly drew between the Church and those into whose hands the control of the organization fell from time to time.

As the responsibilities and proprieties of his position as a priest slipped back into history, the exuberant spirit and wit of the man came to the fore. There is no question that his conscience held him blameless for what had happened to him, and while he grieved that his Church, or rather the men who represented its authority, had condemned and forsaken him, it was grief for their error, for he always felt that all he had done was approved by God.

He let his fancy range where it would and it led him into some wonderful pranks which made his ecclesiastical co-religionists gasp and wince. Among the merriest of these was his treatment of the hackneyed theme, "Blessed are the poor." Plainly, this was an expression of Christ's sympathy for the poor, but was it more? Would not the justifying of poverty as a good thing in itself stultify the Creator who had given the earth for the use of all? And, if the preachers of the blessings of poverty believed their own preachings, why did they themselves carefully avoid it?

But bitterness often crept into his discourses as he drew the distinction between the Church itself, its prin

## 153 / EXCOMMUNICATED

inciples and doctrines, and those who held its temporal power and welfare in their hands. That the treatment he had himself received was the inspiration for much of this there is no doubt, but he carried his denunciation far beyond his own sufferings. Again and again he related bits of history here and there in the course of the growth of the Church—how self-sacrificing men taught the principles of Christianity to primitive peoples who received them gladly and showered their gifts on their benefactors, who at first devoted them to the furtherance of the work

of the Church, such as the building of benefices, churches, seats of learning, etc., only to arouse the cupidity of their successors as the wealth and power of the Church grew, drawing into it ambitious men who loved ease, wealth and power rather than God and mankind. Always the Church had called those who desired to do the Master's will, but the directors and controllers of the Church were seldom chosen from among these.

Perhaps at times he overdid this. While his bitterest enemies could perhaps be accurately described as lovers of the loaves and fishes of the Church rather than of the Church itself, there were others who, less awake intellectually, and unable to differentiate between the Church Eternal and the Church Temporal, could see in it only a maligning of the Holy Catholic Church and condemned him without knowing what they did.

It sounded like the quintessence of heresy to some of his co-religionists to hear him say regarding the necessity of parochial schools to guard Catholic faith and morals:

#### 154 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

If the time ever comes that all the people of this country should be Catholics, then the ecclesiastical machine would absolutely control the education of the country and the people would have nothing whatever to say about the maintenance and direction of a system of education for their children.

But the doctrines of the Prince of Peace acquired a strangely militant meaning as he quoted that enigmatical saying of Jesus: "Think not that I came to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword."

"How," he exclaimed, "can there come to a world ruled by injustice an imperative demand for the righting of hoary wrongs without provoking conflict?"

One of Dr. McGlynn's greatest and meatiest speeches, or sermons, if one prefers to call them that, was delivered to the Anti-Poverty Society on July 30, 1887, on this theme, "Blessed are the poor!"

In it he particularly stressed the fact that Jesus said "Blessed are the poor," not "Blessed is poverty." He was preaching *to* the poor, and the poor heard him gladly. To speak of poverty as a plan of God was to attribute to Him an unwisdom and a cruelty unworthy of God. Who could believe that it is easier to save his soul while starving, and with his wife and children cold and hungry, than when well fed, clothed and sheltered?

"Wealth," he declared, "is neither good nor evil in itself, this depending on how it is acquired, even more than on how it is used. Jesus spoke in severe censure of the rich, but why? Because they were unjustly rich—rich because others had been made poor. It is for this reason that it is easier for a camel to pass through

#### 155 / EXCOMMUNICATED

the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven."

And he related incidents of his student days in Rome, where he had observed that among the thousands of ecclesiastics in the city only a few hundred were doing the

real missionary and preaching work of the Church. An old ecclesiastic had once told him, too, that the Italian people, if asked to name the greatest fault of the clergy of that country, would say "Avarice." That, he said, would be the popular verdict on those who preached to the distressed poor the "blessedness of poverty." The Doctor closed this address with the following peroration:

There are here tonight men who a little while ago hated the very name of God and religion, denying the existence of God because they were told that injustice prevailed by the inscrutable will of God! They hate God and religion no more since they have learned how divinely ordered is the universe, and how devilishly man has mismanaged his garden. It was a magnificent thing for Henry George to say—and a noble and heroically courageous thing for him to say of such as these—that the very hatred in their hearts, the bitterness of their curses on religion, were but a tribute to their outraged sense of divine justice, and that in their very blasphemy they were paying a higher tribute to the justice of God than is paid by those who sit in high places in the churches and synagogues and prate of God's goodness  
—to them!

### THE 1887 CAMPAIGN

There was a comparatively unimportant state election held in New York in 1887. There was no governor to be elected, the most important state offices to be filled

#### 156 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

that year being Secretary of State, Controller and Attorney-General. There was no particular reason why the United Labor party should have interested itself in this election other than its desire to preserve and extend its organization in order to nominate Presidential candidates in 1888. The party held its convention in Syracuse early in August.

Just before the convention of the United Labor party there occurred an incident which may or may not have been a trap for Archbishop Corrigan. The United Labor party of the Eighteenth Assembly District, New York, held a picnic on August 2, at which Dr. McGlynn was scheduled to speak. Now there was no particular occasion for Dr. Curran, his old associate at St. Stephen's, who had been sent up the river to Ellenville after his so-called "penance," to come all the way down to New York to attend that picnic other than his desire to see and hear his old chief, but he came. Henry George was scheduled to preside at the speech making, but for some reason was not on time, and Dr. Curran was asked to take his place and did so.

This was indeed bearding the lion (or was it a tiger?). A priest in regular (though not altogether satisfactory) standing to preside at a political picnic meeting and introduce with complimentary remarks an excommunicated priest! What was the Church coming to?

Fortunately there was someone on this excursion with the ability and the thoughtfulness to jot down some portions of the discourse of the excommunicated priest, which Sylvester L. Malone preserved and printed in his Memorial to Dr. McGlynn and from which the following is selected:

## 157 / EXCOMMUNICATED

Today is doubly for us a blessed day. The physical day is as if we had the ordering of it—no cloud in the sky, the sun beaming on us as if to show us the approving smile of heaven. Nature at her best. We might rise with but little process of logic, as if by a natural instinct of mind and heart, from the beauties of nature to nature's God.

None more—I think you will do me the justice to admit—none more than I could say with fulness of heart, as I have said from earliest childhood, “I have loved, O Lord, the beauty of Thy house, and the place where Thy glory dwelleth.”

But I am glad to come with you from the dust and the heat and the turmoil of the city into the grove that reminds me of the words of our great American poet, that the groves were God's first temples. Here beneath the canopy of heaven, with the beautiful sunlight of God tracing its wondrous ~acework upon the greensward as it is reflected and broken by the waving branches of these trees, I feel that I can with as much propriety, with as much solemnity, with as much deep and heartfelt devotion as ever before any altar, speak to you the truth of God.

Dr. Curran was summoned before Archbishop Corngan and asked to explain why he had appeared on the platform and introduced the excommunicated priest. The *Tribune* reported: “The interview was a spirited one, but Dr. Curran declined to apologize for his action, as he was requested to do by the Archbishop, who warned him not to repeat his offense.”

That was all. So far as anybody knew, no other punishment was inflicted on Dr. Curran, who in due time returned to his flock in Ellenville.

Was it a trap? Dr. McGlynrt and some of his friends said that Dr. Curran's presence in the city was but acci

## 158 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

dental and his visit to the picnic the result of a momentary impulse. Dr. Gurrans himself was noncommittal. He was a cool-headed young man who usually kept his own counsel. But there were those who believed his visit to the picnic was no accident and asserted that he deliberately planned to have himself disciplined by the Archbishop and sent to Rome, in which case he would have gone with joy and with a full determination to make the Vatican pass an authoritative opinion upon the Georgian land theory whether it wanted to or not. Whether the Archbishop surmised this object and lacked the courage of his convictions to put them to the test may never be known.

And now came new trouble, not altogether unexpected, however. The Socialists of the Marxian school had thrown their support whole-heartedly to George in the Mayoralty campaign in 1886, thereby giving his candidacy the Socialistic tinge which had alarmed the conservative propertied classes and given Archbishop Cornigan cold shivers. The Socialists had believed George to be one of themselves, or, barring that, sufficiently friendly to aid them in attaining their objective; at least, not one to throw an obstacle in their way. So, indeed, he was, so far as socializing the land, or rather its rent, was concerned, but beyond that he was thoroughly and immovably individualistic both as to method and objective. Still,

recognizing cooperation as the real soul of Socialism, he did not deny the possibility, even the probability, of a cooperative society developing freely in an atmosphere of economic freedom and justice. "Society is an organism that must grow, not

## 159 / EXCOMMUNICATED

a construction to be built," he said, as he persisted in his own way to better the conditions for social growth.

On the Sunday evening before the United Labor party convention met, Dr. McGlynn, addressing the Anti-Poverty Society in New York, stated his position as follows, according to the *Standard*:

If I have not entirely misunderstood the platform of this society, then this society of ours is not Socialistic; but it is, more than any other American society, magnificently individualistic. If anyone thinks that this society, in order to get a few votes, is going to compromise one tittle of these principles, he makes a great mistake. This society and this party were never organized to get money or votes.

But the Socialists were bent on constructing the party platform to their liking, George objecting. Dr. McGlynn threw his support whole-heartedly to George, the Socialists were beaten, and many contesting Socialist delegations to the convention were excluded. The rift was complete. The split was unfortunate, even tragic, but the Marxians would have it that way. They could consistently support the socialization of the land, but George could not support the socialization of all things.

Henry George was nominated for Secretary of State, Victor A. Wilder of Brooklyn for Controller and Dennis C. Feely of Rochester for Attorney-General.

The campaign was a spirited one. The Doctor threw himself whole-heartedly into it, making many speeches for the ticket, some of them before Anti-Poverty Society audiences. One of the speeches was in Rochester on September 25. Bishop McQuaid sought to "put a spoke in his wheel" by denouncing him in advance from the

## 160 / REBEL,. PRIEST AND PROPHET

Cathedral pulpit. This proving ineffective so far as preventing a large attendance at his meeting was concerned, he preached another and hotter denunciation later in which he condemned those who had attended the meeting and added significantly:

It is, moreover, quite within the right of a bishop to inflict the penalty of excommunication upon those of his own diocese who publicly lend countenance and support to such a defiant and excommunicated cleric.

There were other sermons of similar character, and undoubtedly they had their effect in the election. Though there was no weakening among the members of the Society, the resulting vote was disappointing. The defection of the Socialists, who declared that the United Labor party had fallen under the control of "politicians,"

cost many thousands of votes. The shadow of excommunication which hung over the good priest alienated many more, for Patrick Ford, owner of the *Irish World*, who had been staunch enough while George and Dr. McGlynn were attacking Archbishop Corrigan, weakened when the edict of excommunication was issued and, professing to be outraged by George's attacks on the hierarchy, a hierarchy which had excommunicated an American priest for preaching a doctrine~ openly preached by priests in Ireland without ecclesiastical reproof,. deserted the cause. He had no ambition to share the fate of Mr. O'Loughlin and his *Catholic Herald*.

The defection of Ford and his *Irish World* is a valuable indicator of how the influence of the official heads of the Catholic Diocese of New York was being used

## 161 / EXCOMMUNICATED

again to "save society." It was as Abram Hewitt had said: "I took the nomination for Mayor in 1886 to save society, only to find out later that I had merely saved Tammany Hall."

The ticket polled 73,000 Votes in the state as compared with 68,000 in New York City the year before.

In this campaign was born that ribald story of an intoxicated Irishman who interrupted a George meeting by shouting "Hooray for the two greatest organizations on earth—the Catholic Church and Tammany Hall!" Someone in the audience quickly asked, "What's the other?"

It was during this campaign, too, that heads of great corporations began the habit of patronizing and making friends with the heads of important labor organizations with which and with whom they had always been in conflict. As a means of weaning Labor away from the Georgian land philosophy, the policy has thus far been a huge success, though the rise of the C.I.O. creates doubts as to its soundness.

One of the exciting incidents of the campaign was scarcely political at all, except as friends of Archbishop Corrigan made it so. Eastern District Division Number Three of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, a benevolent organization, had invited the Doctor to deliver a lecture on Friday evening, August 26, the proceeds to be devoted to widows and orphans of members. Ecclesiastical and political pressure was brought to bear on the Division to cancel the engagement. This failing, pressure was brought to bear on the County Board of Directors of the Ancient Order to exert its authority. This also failed, and the Board adopted a resolution to take up

## 162 / REBEL,~PRIEST AND PROPHET

the charter of Division Number Three and disband it. The meeting was held, was presided over by Dr. Edward Malone, brother of the Rev. Fr. Sylvester Malone, was addressed by Dr. McGlynn, and turned out a great success, financially and otherwise. The County Board of Directors was subsequently overruled and Division Number Three had its charter returned.

At the first Anti-Poverty Society meeting following the election, Dr. McGlynn sought to allay the disappointment of his followers and cheer them up by telling them of the fine things the victorious Democrats were going to do for the people.

“Have they not promised, and will they not keep their word? Therefore let us sing—sing ‘Hail, Columbia, Happy Land,’ ‘Land of the Free, Home of the Brave,’ Sing ‘This Is My Own, My Native Land,’ where men seek in vain for the right to work, women faint and children go hungry and cold for want of food, clothing and shelter—and all because the people will it so—the *people*, not God!”

Yes, there was vitriol in his anger disguised as merriment, though in good truth it was more sorrow than anger.

Bishop McQuaid wrote the Archbishop on November ii:

One good result will follow the falling off of the George vote. No matter what George may do in the future McGlynn will have to take a back seat. The politicians all feel that the excommunicated priest hurt the labor cause. They will not want him the next time.

There was Machiavellian wisdom in that, too.

Scarcely had the state campaign of 1887 passed into

### 163 / EXCOMMUNICATED

history than there arose again in various places the story that the Doctor contemplated the eventual establishment of a new church, of which he would be the head. A request by Dr. McGlynn during the campaign that his friends cease their agitation for his restoration gave some color to these stories. No small number of hopes were expressed that he would do something of the kind, and again he had to deny most vehemently that he had any such thought. On Sunday night, December ii, he devoted a part of his address to this subject, saying:

**It** may not be amiss to repeat what we have said so often, that while we meet here on the Sunday evenings consecrated to the service and praise of the Most High and to supplications for His help, while we are never tired of protesting that if it were not for the religion in the movement that has given rise to our society many of us who may seem to be prominent in it would have no part in it, yet it is *not* our purpose to establish a new church, to teach a new religion, to take a new departure. It is our purpose simply to preach to all men who will hear us that great truth which is the only truth of political economy, of wise statesmanship, but so radical and fundamental that we believe it to be the essence and core of all religion.

**It** was on the morning of that day that the Rev. Hugh Pentecost felt compelled to resign the pastorate of the Belleville Avenue Congregational Church, Newark, New Jersey. He had been supported by a majority vote of his congregation, but the minority who had been offended by his espousal of the Georgan philosophy were of the wealthier class who constituted the main financial support of the church, and he felt that his remaining could only breed more dissension in the

### 164 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

organization and further hinder his work. His farewell sermon was published in the *Standard* on December 17. In it, without using that text, he set forth the impossi-



bility of serving God and Mammon.

Thus it is clear that it was not the Roman hierarchy of New York alone that frowned on the doctrine preached by Dr. McGlynn, but that the "respectable propertied class" in all denominations supported the Archbishop and opposed the obnoxious doctrine wherever it showed its head.

There were enough of these incidents throughout the country fairly to confirm the belief that only Dr. McGlynn's refusal to countenance the formation of another church prevented the establishment of what might have been the most truly Christian Church of all.

However violently Henry George assailed the Church, and he handled it and its history roughly indeed, one searches the records of Dr. McGlynn's speeches in vain to find anything aimed at that ideal Church which to him was the only real Church. He did indeed exhibit and exhume about all the important pieces of rascality in which sundry bishops and popes of Rome have engaged at various times during the past fifteen centuries, yet he was careful to recall the authoritative utterances of the truly Christian Popes to show that there is really a Church Eternal that should not be charged with the misdeeds of those who from time to time usurped its garments and dignities. To him it was unthinkable that the Church of Christ could ally itself with oppressors of men anywhere at any time, hence those who were at its head at such times were not truly representative of the Church; they were counterfeits.

165 / EXCOMMUNICATED 165

## THE PARTING OF DAMON AND PYTHIAS

But a politico-economic tragedy was at hand for the New Crusade which was to be of far greater significance than the split with the Socialists had been. If politics makes strange bedfellows, it also sometimes breaks precious associations. Such a break in the association of Dr. McGlynn and Henry George was approaching, and neither of them knew it. Could they have seen its approach, and its consequences, would it have been averted? Who can tell? They divided on no question of principle. It was a question of tactics to be followed in pursuance of a principle in which both believed most fervently which divided them.

Its genesis was in President Grover Cleveland's message to Congress at its December session in 1887. President Cleveland did not absorb his low tariff ideas from George, but there can be little doubt that had Henry George's book, *Protection or Free Trade*, not appeared in the early part of the preceding year and won such widespread praise, Grover Cleveland would not have dared to propose the drastic downward revision of the tariff which he urged upon Congress in that message. Though he was obviously afraid of the epithet "Free Trader," the message bristled with the arguments for and was saturated with the spirit of free trade. He asserted of our protective tariff that, while it increased costs of production and of living, raising the prices of what some sold and others bought, it neither encouraged industry as a whole nor raised wages, but rather tended to isolate us from the world's trade, which must

166 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

be of reciprocal benefit to all nations in order to continue. He viewed the tariff as a mischievous obstruction to the nation's trade with the world. To him there was but one sound reason for having a tariff at all, and that was its necessity as a source of Federal revenue. He therefore urged the revision of the tariff downward to a revenue basis.

Henry George greeted it with joy, as, indeed, did Dr. McGlynn. The leaven of economic liberty was fermenting. But the two reacted differently to the message. Quoting from his book the passage: "The tariff question necessarily opens the whole social question; any discussion of it today must go farther and deeper than the anti-corn law agitation of Great Britain or the tariff controversies of Whigs and Democrats," George urged his followers to "throw themselves into this fight with might and main."

Immediately an alleged interview with Henry George was widely printed by the newspapers, in which he was made to say that he "had decided not to be a candidate for the Presidency, and not to put the United Labor party into the Presidential campaign." George promptly repudiated the interview, saying that he had made no decision for himself and had no authority to make any decision for the party, but this did not stop its circulation. He toyed with the idea of supporting Cleveland for several weeks, to the consternation of many of his friends, before making up his mind to do so.

Dr. McGlynn addressed the Anti-Poverty Society on New Year's night and made his position clear in a masterly address on the political situation. He ridiculed

## 167 / EXCOMMUNICATED

and riddled the position and arguments of the Protectionists, taunting them with the failure of Protection to protect Labor or the wages of Labor; but at the same time he expressed his determination not to be led off the trail of "the land for the people" by any call from Grover Cleveland for tariff reform. He quoted what George himself had said in his book about the inadequacy of free trade, and its benefits being absorbed ultimately by the landed interests unless the land question itself were settled, and settled right. This, he said, was good and sufficient reason for refusing to abandon the land reform for a fight on the tariff that promised little result.

In the *Standard* of January 7, 1888, Henry George urged even more strongly the wisdom of supporting President Cleveland and thus approaching the freeing of the land by way of free trade. Dr. McGlynn's quotation from *Protection or Free Trade* had placed him at some disadvantage and he had to acknowledge that the Doctor was right—that the resulting advance in land value or rent would, indeed, eventually absorb the benefits of free trade, as it absorbed other gains. But he quoted another passage, "This is the way the bull must go to untwist his rope," as justifying his change from a frontal to a flank attack on land monopoly. The decisive move of a master in a game of chess is frequently not recognized as such by the onlookers, and it was so in this case.

The Doctor answered this editorial immediately with a letter, short and to the point, which was published in the *Standard* in its next issue:

UNITED LABOR PARTY, STATE OF NEW YORK,  
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,  
28 Cooper Union,  
NEW YORK CITY, Jan. 9, 1888.

My' DEAR MR. GEORGE:

With reference to your editorial last week, I desire to reaffirm in the columns of the *Standard* what I said as to the duty of the United Labor party in the coming Presidential campaign at the Anti-Poverty meeting on New Year's night as very truly reported in your last issue.

I would add that what we should do is not an open question. Those, of whom I am one, who were requested by the Cincinnati Conference of July last, and charged by the Syracuse Convention, to take action in view of the approach of the national contest, are of one mind on the subject, and will in due time take steps to carry out the plain intent of the mandate. When we shall have entered as a distinct party into the Presidential contest on the lines of our Syracuse platform I should feel recreant to a clear duty if I allowed myself to be diverted by any issue of tariff tinkering, or even by a contest for absolute free trade, from exclusive and unswerving support of our fundamental reform. EDWARD MCGLYNN.

In his reply to this letter, George submitted that the Doctor ignored the fact that we have two distinct governments and two distinct forms of taxation—the national government with its tariff and excise taxes (there were then no income taxes, national or state), and the state governments with their taxes upon property, and said:

Thus there are two distinct lines on which we must work to the accomplishment of our end, the concentration of

169 / EXCOMMUNICATED

taxes on land values. In state politics our line is to work for the abolition of taxes levied on personal property, improvements, etc. In national politics our line is to work for the abolition of tariff and excise taxes. And as national elections alternate with state elections, and national politics blend with state politics, we cannot without great waste of time ignore one line of reform until we have been successful on the other. What our friends who talk of going into the national contest while yet ignoring the tariff question are thinking about is in reality the making of a national fight on state lines . . . **If** we were by some miracle to elect a President upon a no-tariff-issue platform, what would be the very first question to which he would have to address himself after taking office? Would it not be the tariff question?

Certainly the logic of politics no less than the logic of economics points to the

correctness of Henry George's position. But man is not a logical animal, at least not in the mass, and the consequences that year and for many years thereafter afford many reasons for believing that the Doctor was politically the carrier of the two.

### THE ECCLESIASTICAL MACHINE

While this difference of opinion between the Doctor and Henry George was still in the stage of friendly debate, the former delivered to the Anti-Poverty Society on January 8, 1888, an address on "The Pope in Politics," in which he quite surpassed himself. It was in answer to another public speech a short time before by Vicar-General Preston, the Archbishop's able lieutenant, on "The Beneficence of the Pope's Influence in Politics." It is worthy of extensive treatment at this time

#### 170 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

because of developments in recent years in several countries in which the Church of Rome then exercised great political power, but which now seem to have forsaken not merely Catholicism but any and all religion whatever. In his talk the Doctor contrasted the Church as founded by the Nazarene and the apostles with the Church "as is." While he made no statements that are not authenticated history, "nothing hurts like the truth," and some of the things he said doubtless estranged many good Catholics who regarded the Pope as God's veritable viceregent on earth.

In relating the genesis of the Papacy, according to the *Standard*, he quoted Jesus: "I am the good shepherd, and I lay down my life for the sheep," and he quoted him again in His command to Peter: "Feed my sheep!":

And Peter and his successors for three centuries practiced what they preached. They were good shepherds. They loved the sheep for their own sake, and not for their fleece. They endured that supreme test that the Master had chosen as the test of perfect love. Nearly every man of them made good in reality, as every one of them was prepared to make good in spirit, the word of the Master. Nearly every one of them laid down his life for his sheep.

Continuing, he said:

We hear during those centuries of no concordats between the Pope and the Emperor. We hear of no ambassadors, official or semi-official, officious or unofficious, going to back doors or to kitchen stairways, whether of the Palatine or the catacombs, where the Popes had their palaces, to negotiate understandings and compromises between the Pope and the Civil Power. The word Pope had not yet come into

#### 171 / EXCOMMUNICATED

existence. The Bishop of Rome was acknowledged by the Christian Church to be the successor in the See of Rome of blessed Peter. The See of Rome was acknowledged to be by excellence the Apostolic See—to be, beyond all other ones,

the depository of Christian traditions. The Bishop of Rome was acknowledged to have the leadership of the Church of Christ, to be the chief Bishop of the Church.

But the development of the Papal power that has been going on for centuries was then undreamed of. You find little or nothing of it in the epistles of this man Peter, who surely was as good a Pope, or almost as great a Pope, as his Holiness Leo XIII. Men in their enthusiastic reverence for the apostle never dreamed of carrying him on their shoulders, but they carried him in their hearts -

This Christian society, with its priests, its bishops, with the Bishop of Rome acknowledged to be the senior bishop, the presiding bishop, the successor of Peter, the inheritor of his office because of his adherence to the spirit of the Master, conquered the whole of the civilized world. It was the spirit of Christ, and not the sword of Peter. Thus it was, Dr. McGlynn continued, until in an evil day the Emperor Constantine, needing Christian help probably more than he wanted Christian charity, professed miraculous conversion through his vision of a cross in the heavens surmounted by the magic legend, "*In Hoc Signo Vincas*" (By This Sign Thou Shalt Conquer), and from the time that Constantine gave the sanction of law to the edicts of the Bishop, declared the Doctor, the decay of Christianity began:— And we, better than the Christians of the centuries that followed the time of Constantine, can see what a sad mistake it was, what a pitiable and unfortunate thing it was, that the Church of Christ was befriended, protected, en-

## 172 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

riched, not merely with wealth, but with temporal power, by Constantine and his successors. Thence dates the beginning of the degeneration of the Christian Church. The privilege of wearing the purple comes from Constantine, not from Christ!

Great princes, emperors, wealthy testators, lavished boundless wealth upon the Church, that the Church might be their ~ in doing works of religion, of education, of charity—and sometimes of protecting their interests!

The picture he drew of the consequences of the accretion of political power in ecclesiastical hands was not a pleasant one. Concentration of power in human hands was bad for the race, regardless of the hands in which it lodged. As with a modern moving picture he threw upon the screen word-vignettes of the growth of the ecclesiastical machine until it broke of its own weight in the great Reformation, not sparing the machine as he outlined the scandals of the Borgias, which culminated in the rebellion led by Martin Luther. Coming down to his own time, he sketched the recent history of Anglo-Irish relations, of Papal interferences in the politics of other European countries and in American politics which had had such deplorable results to date, and asked:

Is it necessary for the office of Peter that his successor shall be today the worst enemy of his country, that he shall be the chief obstacle to the liberty, the unity and the independence of Italy?

One of the most unpardonable and, in some views amazing, aspects of the subject is that the greatest sticklers for this temporal power, this kingship, of the Pope, for what they call the spiritual and the temporal sovereignty of the

## 173 / EXCOMMUNICATED

Vicar of Christ, are men converted from English or American Protestantism. Talk about Irish Catholics! I am glad to vindicate the Irish blood within me by saying that the most incredible subserviency, the most brutal adulation of the Pope, comes from converts, English and American, to the Catholic faith, and that some of the best hopes of resistance to the undue assumption of temporal power, the restraining of the Pope's power where it has no business to be, lies today in the rebellious spirit of Irish Catholics. (*Tremendous applause.*)

"The Beneficence of the Pope's Influence in Politics!" It is the curse of nearly every nation. It has been the curse of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, England, Ireland. God forbid! God forbid that the thing should have an ill-omened revival! There is a sort of revival just now, but I am glad to believe—in fact, I think I know—that it is a sort of opera bouffe revival.

Of this speech Bishop McQuaid wrote the Archbishop in part as follows:

McGlynn's crazy utterances last Sunday finished him, if he was not dead already. It looks to me as if he felt that his return to the Church was no longer to be thought of. The causes of this complete self-abandonment lie elsewhere than in his ridiculous land theories. [Bishop McQuaid still entertained the idea that there was "a woman in the case" of Dr. McGlynn.] Anyone who upholds the miserable apostate after this public exhibition of his hatred of the Sovereign Pontiff is almost as bad as himself.

Two weeks later, on January 22, the Doctor followed this blast with another, which he called "The Ecclesiastical Machine in American Politics," though he by no means confined his observations to this country. Subse

## 174 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

quent history has placed the stamp of true prophecy on parts of this speech, demonstrating that his vision of "coming events casting shadows before" was clear and distinct. He began, as before, by differentiating between his ideal of the true Catholic Church and true Catholicism and the ecclesiastical organization which he believed to be perverting this ideal. I quote from the *Standard*:

Our quarrel is not and must not be with the Catholic Church, her dogmas and her sacraments, but with the ecclesiastical machine which works by such unworthy means for purposes not holy. We must have a quarrel with that machine and with that policy in order to maintain not merely our liberties, but also to maintain our holy religion itself.

His criticism of the policy of the "ecclesiastical machine" in this country presented little that was new; much of it had been said two weeks previously and on other occasions. But he gave an unlooked-for turn to it all in his prophetic conclusion, in which he seemed to burn his bridges behind him, as follows:

The old-fashioned Protestant hatred of the ecclesiastical machine is largely dying out here, but there is a new and most intense and passionate hatred of this machine growing up in Catholic countries. In Italy, in France, in Spain, in South Germany, in Portugal, and in Latin America, wherever the Catholic Church is supposed to

reign almost supreme, there is a new kind of Protestantism, which in revolting against the ecclesiastical machine has taken refuge in infidelity, in seeking the things of this world and almost forgetting the things of the next.

## 175 / EXCOMMUNICATED

We desire to abolish poverty because the miseries, the vices, the crimes that flow from poverty are crushing the souls of men. We wage war against poverty as another form of waging a conflict for the essence of all religion. The greatest curse that can happen to religion is when those who are charged with its blessed offices seek to control what Christ and natural religion and right reason have never given them any authority to control.

This is the curse of religion everywhere today—that men charged with the high duty of preaching the gospel are itching for something else. It is to control politics. It is to control education. It is to have authority with men in power, whether in church or state, to magnify their own office.

The authorities of the Church of Rome and other churches as well who now agonize over the godlessness of Russia, Mexico, Spain, Germany and the world in general would do well to exhume this and other prophetic speeches of the excommunicated priest and study them prayerfully.

Despite Dr. McGlynn's uncompromising attitude, his friends in St. Stephen's Parish continued unremittingly their efforts for his restoration. He had seen that this was now impossible and had asked them to desist, but they would not. More drastic measures were necessary to bring them to see the situation as he saw it, so in a speech delivered to the Anti-Poverty Society on February 6, 1888, he made his request an imperative demand.

The address was memorable, not only for this, but for the way in which he criticised the Knights of Labor and other organizations aiming at bettering the condi

## 176 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

tion of the masses, organizations indigenous to America, for their efforts to placate and secure the friendship, endorsement or good opinion of Rome. I again quote from the *Standard*:

The obvious attitude of the Knights of Labor should be to say to each individual: "We care nothing for your religion. You may believe anything or nothing, and if the rules of this society do not suit you or your religion, you may get out!"

Coming to his request by a rather circuitous route, he said:

I have told you some of the things I think about the ecclesiastical machine, so I will not thrash that straw over again - . - I repressed myself for the sake of a higher good, but in spite of my earnest desire to avoid the present condition of things, it has, as if by a special providence, been forced upon me.

My head has, unfortunately, been cut off, and I discover that I am able to preach to larger multitudes, with more freedom, more energy, more force, and as if God

himself were blessing my efforts. I humbly believe He is, with perhaps more efficacy than ever before, aiding me in preaching the truths of God. I accept the situation. I wrote a letter last Friday to my beloved friends of St. Stephen's Parish, who have shown such extraordinary devotion to me, and what I said I meant. And I desire here tonight to remove all suspense and to say that their protest is simply worse than futile. I appreciate and reciprocate their love and sympathy. I am grateful for their generosity. But it is simply impossible, without a moral revolution, for me to be ever again the pastor of St. Stephen's Church. It is morally certain that for many years I shall never, with the permission

## 177 / EXCOMMUNICATED

of bishop or archbishop or cardinal or pope, minister before any Catholic altar. That is the painful fact, and I beg of my dear friends to accept it and make the best of it.

And therefore do I desire (*murmurs and cries of "No! No!"*), and I insist, and I have a right to insist, that these meetings of vain and hopeless protest and the source of unnecessary irritation, shall cease. I beg it as a favor and I demand it as a right. (*Rounds of applause, mingled with renewed cries of "No! No!"*)

It has been said rather facetiously that this is not my funeral. If it is not my funeral, whose is it? (*a voice: "A rchbishop Corrigan's"*) No! I am the cause of it, the cause of the dissension. They will not send me back, and now, to terminate the matter, I don't want to go back! And you, and you, if you love me, should not ask me to go back, for it is impossible for me to go back without retracting and humbly apologizing for what I have said from this platform, *and I never shall!*

The crowd went wild with enthusiastic approval and it was several minutes before he solemnly continued:

I cheerfully and loyally profess my allegiance to all the teachings of Christ and His holy religion, to all the spiritual doctrines of the Apostolic Church, and my profoundest reverence for all the sacred things of which she is the custodian; and I reaffirm, with all possible solemnity—and I should do it if this were my dying breath—that I believe the Church of Christ has largely been ruined by the despotism, by the politics, by the intrigues, by the love of temporal power and wealth of what we call the "ecclesiastical machine."

This attitude he maintained, at times in more accentuated language, throughout the period of his excommunication.

## 178 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

### CHRISTIAN BURIAL

From time to time members of the Anti-Poverty Society had died and some of them had been denied burial in consecrated ground. Dr. McGlynn comforted the families of such with the admonition that such burial was merely conventional and by no means necessary, instancing the Saints whose ashes had been scattered to the winds of heaven and the good people who had died and been buried at sea or under



other circumstances where recovery of their bodies was impossible. But there came a death in a family which refused such comfort. John McGuire died suddenly on February 17, 1887, at an Anti-Poverty meeting and was by Archbishop Corrigan denied burial in Calvary Cemetery, where he had owned a lot since 1870. His son, Philip, as administrator of the estate, instituted suit for an injunction restraining the trustees of St. Patrick's Cathedral from interfering with the burial of his father in the family plot and for \$1,000 damages. The case was carried from court to court and finally to the United States Supreme Court.

Nearly a year later, while the case was still undecided, Prince Rudolph, heir apparent of the throne of Austria-Hungary, died a suicide, and his funeral and entombment according to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church brought from Dr. McGlynn a blistering blast of sarcasm against the "ecclesiastical machine" and its wondrous ways. This address was delivered on February 10, 1888, at Cooper Union, under the title of "Christian Burial—Prince Rudolph and John McGuire." A part of his talk was as follows:

### 179 / EXCOMMUNICATED

John McGuire was a Christian; so I believe was Prince Rudolph. John McGuire practiced the precepts of the Christian Church. The public prints, the semi-official accounts, unfortunately, do not permit us to believe that Prince Rudolph was a very devout, practical Christian. John McGuire worked all his life to support himself and others. Prince Rudolph never worked at all. John McGuire never asked charity of any man. Prince Rudolph was simply a royal, imperial pauper. Prince Rudolph, because he had the unspeakable misfortune of being an imperial prince, his father's son, was compelled to lead a useless, idle life, to receive enormous salaries for doing nothing. He would not have been permitted to soil his princely hands by doing honest productive work. Prince Rudolph was permitted to squander, and almost called upon as if it were the duty of his position to squander, hundreds of thousands of dollars wrenched from the blood, the tears and the unrequited toil, the robbery, of thousands of men. Prince Rudolph was one of the highest specimens of that class that lives upon the folly, the ignorance, the stupidity, the prejudices and the superstitions of mankind. John McGuire was one of the masses. .

Prince Rudolph, according to the official statement, died by his own hand. He shot himself through the head. He did it all with deliberateness. He wrote letters to friends which showed he contemplated taking his own life. Suicide is a crime. It is explicitly the teaching of Catholic theology that to kill one's self is simply self-murder, and is as heinous a crime as to kill anybody else. The practice of the Catholic Church is to deny Christian burial to those who die in the very act of sin.

In spite of all that, Prince Rudolph is buried with all the possible rites of the Church. A solemn high mass is sung, a cardinal archbishop presides, and a nuncio of His

### 180 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

Holiness, the Pope, is a conspicuous participant in the ceremony. The remains, after this solemn high mass, are carried with all possible pomp to another church. The mere ordinary consecrated soil is no fit resting place for the anointed remains of a royal prince. The sepulchres of these princes of the House of Hapsburg are in

the custody of the Church of God. They are actually enshrined in a holy temple, and a religious order of the Catholic Church, the Capuchin Monks of Vienna, have the distinguished honor of being the custodians of the sepulchres of the princes of the House of Hapsburg..

And John McGuire is denied Christian burial! Why? Because John McGuire died, not by his own hand, but by the hand of God, in the Academy of Music, just before the opening of one of the meetings of the Anti-Poverty Society! The fact of his dying there gave special occasion to the Vicar-General and the Archbishop to refuse Christian burial to his remains, although John McGuire had purchased the right of burial in Calvary Cemetery. He had acquired legal right to interment in that plot. He had as good, as clear, as strong, a right to burial in that plot as Prince Rudolph had to be buried in his marble tomb in the Church of the Capuchins of Vienna. Prince Rudolph was the son of the Emperor, and John McGuire was a poor workingman. So the Vicar-General felt that he could without much danger of offending any powerful faction—nay, rather with the applause of powerful factions—deny Christian burial to John McGuire....

What was the Academy of Music meeting for? To promote the objects of the Anti-Poverty Society. Are these objects un-Christian? Certainly not. The very essence of all religion is the doctrine of this Society, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. We are fired by enthusiasm “to justify the ways of God to man,” to show to the

## 181 / EXCOMMUNICATED

outraged, robbed, enslaved masses of men that the horrors of our civilization are not the result of God’s holy will, but are the result of the violation of His will. We would assert for all God’s children equal rights. John McGuire, the dear, good old man, felt some touch of this holy enthusiasm. He applauded this gospel of humanity. He was there for no other purpose....

A thousand times would I rather take my chances with God the Father tonight in the person of John McGuire than in that of Prince Rudolph of Austria.

The New York *Sun*, a strong partisan of the Archbishop, printed a scandalously unfair report of this address the following morning. The Doctor had really treated the memory of the Prince with restraint, but the *Sun* described him as “handling him without gloves” and speaking of him as “His Ethereal Highness.” It asserted that Father McGlynn had spoken of John McGuire as “the first saint of the Anti-Poverty Society” and called him “Saint John McGuire.” The caption of the article was “Prince Rudolph and St. McGuire.”

Michael Clarke, Secretary of the Society, promptly wrote the *Sun* a letter denying their statements, but the letter was not published until the following Sunday, and then only after Mr. Clarke had gone to the *Sun* office personally to stir them up. Other papers, too, seemed to regard the “excommunicated priest” as fair game for jokes and displays of wit, but the *Sun* was vicious in its misrepresentations.

In December, 1888, Bishop McQuaid was in Rome, seeking the undoing of Dr. Burtzell, who had supported the McGuire side in this quarrel. On the 13th he wrote to Archbishop Corrigan:

## 182 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

I am still waiting for the stenographic report of Burtzell's testimony in the McGuire case. Cardinal Simeoni is timorous to a frightful degree. No doubt he is often censured for being hasty and for not having his facts well in hand. Burtzell has avowed himself the friend and counsel of this abominable apostate. When I present his case and that of Malone [Father Sylvester] I want to make them as strong as possible.

Burtzell stated that, the Anti-Poverty meetings not having been condemned, McGuire did no wrong in attending them. If Burtzell has not forgotten his theology or lost his conscience, he knows full well that cooperation and aiding in such doings is a grievous sin, aggravated by the fact that these meetings do more harm and lead more souls astray than the preachings of all the Protestant ministers in the city. .

I would advise you to prepare a letter, instancing some of the worst expressions of McGlynn at these meetings, stating the fact of his excommunication by the Pope, and that those who uphold him in his rebellion partake of his sin, even if they do not incur the minor excommunications; that these meetings partake of a quasi-religious character, even though so blasphemous in character; that, therefore, inasmuch as some ecclesiastics are leading the simple laity astray by giving them to understand that it is not forbidden for the laity to be present at these meetings, it becomes your duty to etc., etc.

Prepare the letter carefully, consulting, if you think it necessary, one or more safe advisers before fulminating. Be clear, strong and bold, and not afraid.

The Archbishop duly prepared such a paper, and had it read in the churches, with consequences to be related later.

## 183 / EXCOMMUNICATED

### DxsuNrrY AND DISASTER

However clearly the cold logic of the politico-economic situation may have been with Mr. George, the instincts of most of Dr. McGlynn's followers, a large minority of whom were Protestants, revolted against the policy of supporting Cleveland merely because he might do something for free trade. They did not fully realize that taxes on industry and taxes on trade are of one nature. Indeed, many of them were protectionists—at least until the principle of "the land for the people" should have triumphed. They perceived with the Doctor that supporting Cleveland involved the practical abandonment of their newly organized United Labor party, whose sole reason for existence was its demand of "the land for the people," and George's decision just broke their hearts.

With the two giants of the movement divided, there arose in both camps the poison of mutual suspicion, which further alienated those who had been won by the eloquence and personal magnetism of the two men but had imbibed little real understanding of what it was all about. Reckless charges and countercharges of treachery to their common cause flew back and forth. On the one hand, George

was charged with having “sold out” to the Democrats, while on the other, Dr. McGlynn was charged with being a “tool of the Republicans.”

The belief of Dr. McGlynn’s partisans that Mr. George for unworthy reasons had deserted the good priest in the hour of his need when his beloved Church had cast him into outer darkness added to the bitter-

## 184 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

ness, which flamed even more fiercely when the friends of Mr. George, who at that time constituted a majority of the executive committee of the Anti-Poverty Society, sought to gain control of the organization by ousting the Doctor from his position as its president. Dr. McGlynn, sensing that something of the kind might be attempted, forestalled them by appointing a number of his friends to the committee, a power he possessed under its laws but had refrained from exercising lest it give the Society a too sectarian complexion.

Mr. George and his friends at the first meeting of the committee thereafter were quickly made to recognize the new situation. They withdrew, and the split was complete. The parishioners of St. Stephen’s, most of the Catholics and a considerable number of Protestants in the movement sided with the Doctor. “Follow Father McGlynn! He sees the situation more clearly than any other man,” was the argument that held them together.

At the next meeting of the Anti-Poverty Society Dr. McGlynn was unnecessarily sarcastic, personal and hitter in his recital of the incidents of that meeting of the executive committee at which he had defeated the efforts of the Georgeites to oust him from the presidency. Henry George printed the speech in the *Standard*, but from that time onward Dr. McGlynn’s name was seldom mentioned in that paper, and his meetings were ignored. Consigning the opposition to oblivion was practiced as a fine art by most newspapers and periodicals even in that day.

The United Labor party held its convention, endorsed its Syracuse platform demanding the raising of all public revenue by a single tax upon the value of

## 185 / EXCOMMUNICATED

land irrespective of improvements, ignored the dominating tariff issue and nominated H. H. Cowdray for President and W. T. Wakefield for Vice-President, while Henry George with the *Standard* and most of the more prominent advocates of land value taxation supported Grover Cleveland.

Unity is the support of all institutions, and the movement for land reform had lost its unity. Both wings held meetings, large meetings, enthusiastic meetings, but not the meetings that would have been held had the two leaders remained together. Dr. McGlynn, the excommunicated priest, was the one “trump” of the United Labor party, and his close associates stuck to him loyally, but the steady exercise of ecclesiastical pressure against him was becoming effective among the masses, weaning away many whose allegiance was based more on emotion than on understanding and who had never fully comprehended his philosophy. Though Dr. McGlynn himself possessed a mind of surpassing clearness, his greatest power over men lay in his ability to arouse their sense of ethical relations rather than in his exposition of practical economic measures.

Henry George made so spirited a campaign for Cleveland and real free trade, repealing taxes upon both trade and industry and concentrating them on land

values, and the crowds applauded him so enthusiastically, that the managers of the Democratic party became alarmed and coined a new marching chant for their torchlight parades:

“Don’t—don’t——don’t be afraid!  
Tariff Reform is NOT Free Trade.”

## 186 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

Yet to many minds Mr. George seemed to be a man who had deserted the cause he had started.

The result of the campaign was a vote of 1,72 i for the United Labor party candidates in New York City (then consisting only of Manhattan and the Bronx), and the defeat of Grover Cleveland. There be those who have always believed that Cleveland’s defeat was due more to the timidity of his party managers than to the issue on which he ran. “Conservatives” breathed more freely, feeling that the teeth of a threatening radical movement had been drawn. They had not learned, they have not yet learned, that true radicalism threatens no just or righteous institution or interest; that true radicalism, which aims to eradicate only what is bad in our economic system, is entirely consistent with true conservatism, which aims to preserve what is good.

The “Priest and the Prophet” parted, not to meet again as friends for years. Both lost more than the public support which would have been theirs had they remained united, for both lost the mutual counsel that was their greatest strength. Thus we find the Doctor as early as June in that Presidential year trying to organize the tenants of New York City into a Low Rent League, urging them to refuse to pay more than a “fair rent” for their homes and by their very numbers make evictions difficult or impossible. Mr. George in his *Standard* could only rebuke the Doctor for the futility of any fight along that line. Dr. McGlynn, through his long associations as a priest, had a keener perception of mass psychology than Mr. George, but the latter was always the master analyst of economic problems who thought things through to the end.

## 187 / EXCOMMUNICATED

Perhaps it was for this reason that Henry George and the *Standard* suffered the greater immediate damage from the quarrel. Ignoring the United Labor party and its meetings, the members of that party ignored the paper in turn. The *Standard* lost circulation at an alarming rate and soon ran into “red ink.” It had never been able to secure any considerable advertising support. Eventually Mr. George was obliged to relinquish his control of the paper. It struggled along under several different managements until 1892, when it expired.

The split with the Socialists in 1887, when the differences were fundamental, bred less bitterness than did this split between men who were united in a common purpose and differed only in regard to the tactics to be pursued in achieving it. Of course the “I told you so’s” which each wing hurled at the other when the

wreckage was complete had no conciliatory effect.

Could they have agreed? The judgment of friends of both men was and is sadly mixed. It is many years since anyone has questioned the motives of either man, but the argument as to which displayed the better judgment has reached no conclusion. There were those who believed that Dr. McGlynn, most unselfish of men, to whom was given in such overwhelming measure the love, admiration and adulation of his followers, was affected thereby to a degree which impaired his judgment, even to inspiring in him somewhat of a Messiah complex. They intimated that it would have taken a superman to remain immune to this devotion, which almost amounted to worship. The theory seems to contain certain elements of plausibility until we recall that the course he was asked to take involved the abandon-

## 188 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

ment of the United Labor party and the disruption of the Anti-Poverty Society. He was the one man in these organizations who could hold either or both together. Wherever he went, he was their one "big gun," and his persuasive oratory seemed to sweep all opposition before it. How could he consent to a course that must disintegrate them?

As for Henry George, the man who had thought this economic philosophy out by himself, the entering of politics for the sake of winning office and power before his philosophy was widely understood was anathema. To him a political campaign was merely an opportunity to center the public mind on his proposal and induce a study of it. He was glad he had not been elected Mayor of New York, telling his close friends that he had far more important work to do than fighting politicians in the City Hall. The failure of the 1887 state campaign had indicated to him that the United Labor party was disintegrating and therefore offering diminishing educational opportunities, and this led him to seek other avenues for the promulgation of his ideas. President Cleveland's tariff message to Congress at its December session that year seemed to open the very avenue he desired for an attack on vicious taxation on a national front, since only the Federal Government has jurisdiction over the tariff, and he seized it eagerly.

However united these two men and their followers were in their ultimate objective, how could they, under these conditions, agree on the method to be followed in the immediate present?

The pity, the tragedy, of their parting lay less in the parting itself than in the ill-feeling and mutual recrim

## 189 / EXCOMMUNICATED

ination that grew out of it and for years prevented their mutual counsel and cooperation; that those who desired to seize the opportunity afforded by a national tariff controversy to present to the country the merits of commercial freedom as part and parcel of the larger philosophy of complete economic freedom, to show that production and trade were not separate things, but only mentally separable parts of the same thing, that trade was the purpose of production without which industry must languish, were called "quitters" and "traitors" by those who adhered to the party with its local-issue platform in a national campaign which raged about a national issue.

Henry George later explained in the *Standard* that his ignoring of the United Labor party during the campaign was due to no personal differences between him and Dr. McGlynn, but to the fact that the party had been “Butlerized” in the interest of the Republican party, and that Protectionist money had been used to that end. He absolved the Doctor from any participation in the deal, but of the “prostitution of what was in the beginning a noble movement” he felt certain. The explanation did not suffice to heal the break.

This year of tragedy was not without its humorous incidents, however. Early in the summer, before the political conventions were held, Dr. McGlynn took his two young nephews, Charles and Joseph Whelan, up to Vermont for a vacation. There they had the time of their young lives and in due time started for home, via

1. General Benjamin Butler had been nominated by disgruntled Democrats in 1884 for the express purpose of defeating Grover Cleveland for the Presidency.

## 190 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

steamer on Lakes Champlain and George, rail to Albany and Day Line boat down the Hudson. It so happened that General William Tecumseh Sherman of Civil War fame, who was making a farewell tour of the country, visiting G.A.R. Posts and greeting his old comrades-in-arms, was on the same Hudson River boat. At every point where the boat stopped, delegations of G.A.R. men were assembled to do him honor, and to all these assemblages the General responded with a brief speech expressing his appreciation of their greeting.

At last the steamer approached the New York pier. It was packed by an immense throng, and the General prepared to “do his stuff.” But that speech was never delivered. Something was wrong. The crowd was shouting some name, but it was not Sherman. No, it was not General Sherman for whom the crowd was calling. It was a volunteer delegation of the Anti-Poverty Society, and the man they had come to greet was Dr. Edward McGlynn.

General Sherman used to enjoy telling this story.

## THE STREET-CAR STRIKE

In January, 1889, there was a strike on the street railways of New York that tied up the service. The State Board of Arbitration had offered its services to mediate in the dispute. The strikers had accepted the offer, but the street-car companies had rebuffed the board’s offer as an interference with their business. At the meeting of the Anti-Poverty Society in Cooper Union on February 3, at which Michael Clarke presided, John McMackin offered a resolution that the Society considered it the duty of the companies to submit their dif

## 191 / EXCOMMUNICATED

ferences with their employes to arbitration in the interest of the public, and Dr. McGlynn, seconding the resolution, spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few remarks to sustain the resolution just proposed. There is a State Board of Arbitration. As its name implies, it is an

official body appointed by the sovereign authority of the people of the State of New York. It is the duty of these railroad companies to administer, not what is their private property, but what is a public trust committed to them by public franchise. The offer on the part of the State Board of Arbitration to consider the differences between the horse railroad companies and their employes was no fussy, meddlesome, impertinent interference on the part of busybodies, but was in fulfillment of a duty for which this Board was appointed.

The only excuse for granting those great public franchises to private companies is the hope that they will serve the public faithfully for a reasonable return on the capital invested. It has been part of our platform to assert the right of the people to own and control the great highways of the state, the railroads, because they are the creation of the state and are more or less monopolies. These railroad companies are in some measure holding the position of officials in the service of the public. We therefore, in sustaining these resolutions, are not meddling in what does not concern us. We are speaking in the interest of the public. We are speaking from sympathy with struggling workingmen.

This street-car strike may or may not be successful, but if the men engaged in it are not greater fools than I take them to be, they will begin to learn the necessity of a more radical remedy than the clumsy one of a strike for the wrongs that are oppressing the great masses of men. The

## 192 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

men in sympathy with the principles of this Society have pointed out what this remedy is, a radical remedy that shall restore to men their God-given heritage out of which they have been cheated chiefly by their own stupidity. .

Dear, struggling, starving, agonized brethren, how long will you remain so grossly ignorant of your rights? You have my sympathy, dear friends, but you do try my patience a little at times. And if the very afflictions that you are suffering shall open your eyes and make you and others like you emancipate yourselves once for all from the politicians and assert your rights, then, painful as the experience is, it will have been worth all it costs. Mr. Chairman, I am in full sympathy with the resolution and it has my vote.

The resolution having been carried without a dissenting voice, Dr. McGlynn began his address, his subject being "The Church and the Poor." I quote from an old copy of the address published by the Anti-Poverty Society:

It is only two weeks since, in the churches of that ecclesiastical body whose boast it is in some measure that it has the poor with it, from scores of altars there was read a letter denouncing this Society, largely because of the doctrines taught by it. This Society has for its object the abolition of poverty, the emancipation of the masses of men from industrial slavery, the restoring to all men of their God-given equal rights to exert their powers of brain and body upon the natural bounties. We hold that the restoration of this right to men will necessarily abolish involuntary poverty by giving to all abundant opportunity to employ themselves, and by creating an enormous demand for human labor, will necessarily compel the greater employment of labor upon the choicer portions of the common estate; so that the law of rent, which, ill-applied, is the



## 193 / EXCOMMUNICATED

curse of humanity, will when properly applied become the most fruitful source of blessings to humanity.

We have no quarrel with the payment of rent, but we have an eternal war with the payment of rent to the wrong man. We hold that all property comes from making something; that the idea of ownership comes from working, so that God, being the maker of all things, is necessarily the owner of all things. But the Creator must necessarily have given us the ownership of ourselves. And when He made us His children, surely He made us the slaves of no man. He asks of us reasonable homage. He asks us to obey no law that does not present its credentials to us and show that it is a just one. He asks us to respect no authority unless that authority shall proceed from Him.

Such being our royal dignity as children of the King that He cannot call us His slaves, shall He ask us to be slaves of a thing like ourselves? - . . . The owner of a chattel slave, as a matter of business, had to take an interest in the welfare of the slave. He would see that the valuable man that had cost him a thousand dollars had a dry roof over him, something better than a leaky thatch, and that he did not have to keep his children in the same room with the pigs, having sometimes almost to battle with the pigs for a crust of bread. You have got to go to the classic land of landlordism to see that. You never would have seen that in the cabins of Southern slaves. The valuable man might become ill; the people of the mansion must be informed, and the son and heir would mount the best horse to get the best doctor in the county to come speedily and save the life of the thousand-dollar man.

Under the conditions of landlordism the man becomes ill, he is behind with the rent, the agent tells the landlord. What is the remedy? Evict him! "But the man is ill, his wife is ill." What cares the landlord for that? Business is

## 194 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

business. And all the power of the so-called law comes to the aid of that infernal man; that man is sustained in his hellish work by all the panoply of the law. All the mighty forces of the mightiest of empires are brought to force that man out on the roadside in snow and rain, and officers of the law come with crowbars to make the eviction more effectual by destroying the cabin the man was born in, which, miserable as it is, was the only place that he could ever call a home.

There is as much tearing of the heartstrings in the eviction from the mud cabin as if it were a palace. And then the saddest of all is to think that men bearing the name of Christ, who sit in the high seats of His Christian Church, are ready with curses and ecclesiastical censures to help on the "Godly" work! .

"The poor you have always with you!" And they dare to quote this text of the Master as if it were a perpetual consecration of this hellish poverty—as if in order to carry out Christ's spirit we must alleviate poverty, if we can, just a little, but be careful not to abolish it, so that our occupation would be gone and we would have no more almsgiving to do.

But Christ commended holy poverty, did He not? Yes, holy poverty, Christian poverty, the magnificent spiritual detachment of the animal man from the love of material things; the using these things, as St. Paul commends, as if we used them not. The Father in heaven would have us lift up our hearts. He knows that we need bread, raiment, shelter, that material things rightly used can become the

magnificent instruments of His praise. Detachment from undue love of these things is well. This holy poverty is good. The poverty professed by men of God, by religious orders, is good. But it is something very, very different from the poverty we would abolish. Those who profess holy pov.

I

## 195 / EXCOMMUNICATED

erty in religious orders are bound by their vow of obedience to take good care of their health. The vow of poverty

practically means—and I have no quarrel with that at all, it is an excellent proper thing—that as long as they live, if they behave themselves moderately well and do what they are told, they shall have an admirable house to live in, with every possible thing that is necessary for comfort and well-being, a dry roof (not a leaky thatch), a good floor so well kept that you could almost without reluctance eat your dinner off it, very different from the mud floor and the pigs, and an infirmary to which it is their duty to go in time of illness. I have said it in a pleasant spirit, and it is true:

The vow of poverty secures a tight roof, a good floor, a comfortable bed, the best of attendance and medicine in illness, a very excellent table always well supplied, not without some regard to the delicacies of the season—and I have no fault to find with that. I say it is good.

But it is a monstrous mockery, it is an outrage upon the agonized masses of men, to tell us that because the Christian Church wisely and properly commends detachment from family and home on the part of a certain number of men and women, that they may be like soldiers in the Christian army going out to battle for Christ, that because this holy poverty is a good thing, therefore the poverty that we are trying to abolish is also a good thing. Would not the greater part of the people of the world think their condition immensely improved if they could have as good houses and as good beds and as good provision in illness secured to them as long as they live, as are secured by the vow of poverty and obedience in the religious orders?

Since this address was delivered the country has more than doubled in population, our public domain is exhausted, we have gone through three of the worst depressions in history and the world has fought a war

## 196 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

from which civilization still staggers. Many millions are dependent upon public relief. Yet Labor still sticks with childish faith to the “strike” as an effective means to better its condition.

## EXCOMMUNICADO

Various and divergent stories have been told regarding the Doctor’s private life and experience while under the ban of excommunication, and especially after his break with Henry George. A Newburgh lady who knew j him well throughout that period as well as Later when he was sent to take charge of a Newburgh church,

told me of a dreadful depression which accompanied his illness early in 1887 when he was under suspension and had been ordered to go to Rome within forty days of receipt of the command. "Dear lady," he said to her, as she tried to cheer him up. "Dear lady, it seems as if my heart stops beating whenever a blue envelope comes to me from the Archiepiscopal Palace."

On another occasion, after the ban had fallen, she had seen him in a similar state of depression. "I am the Lord's fool," he told her, as he stood steadfast in his belief that he could not do otherwise.

It seems quite certain that he never was lonesome for want of company; his thousands of devoted friends among former parishioners and among Catholics and non-Catholics from other parts of the state and country at large saw to that. But there were other reasons for his depression, of which he said little save to his most intimate friends.

One of these reasons was that already mentioned— the large number of Catholics who had left the Church

## 197 / EXCOMMUNICATED

because of his excommunication, unable longer to identify themselves with it because of that fact. Why the course of reasoning which sustained him in his own case failed to sustain him for them also is not clear. They had followed their conscience even as he had.

That he could have passed through the five and a half years that he was under the ban of the Church without spending many hours of lonely anxiety and grief is unthinkable, but no one who knew him can believe this anxiety and grief were for himself or the course he had taken at the dictate of his conscience. Rather they were for the course which the high officials of the Church, misled by Archbishop Corrigan and his mentor, Bishop McQuaid, had taken toward what he recognized as a new revelation of the will of God which all mankind should obey, a veritable fulfillment of Christ's prophecy:

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Here, he was convinced, was the truth. Why, oh, why did his beloved Church reject it?

He believed the "ecclesiastical machine" had let pass an opportunity to start a movement that ultimately would have reunited the scattered sects of the Christian faith in one truly Christian and universal Church and established a civilization worthy of the name, and the thought filled him alternately with rage and grief.

It is the testimony of surviving members of his sister's family, with whom he made his home, that, as a rule, the Doctor was too busy to have much time for lonely grieving.

His household itself was not a small one, for, besides his sister's family, several relatives made their home

## 198 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

with him. The stream of visitors which had pestered him at the Astor House found its way to his Brooklyn home and there were at times continuing files of them. Many of them were priests who came to him, Nicodemus-like, for counsel on matters both religious and secular. Some of these visitors were of high churchly

rank.

Reporters were his chief trouble. There was less honor among them regarding “off the record” talks than there is today, for the reporter’s order was to get his story, regardless of how he got it. Moreover, the newspapers themselves were more or less accustomed to conducting their news columns in accordance with their editorial policies, a custom now taboo in best newspaper circles.

Why the Doctor submitted to the importunities of the reporters as he did is understandable only by recalling his compassionate desire to help everybody. Knowing the reporter must not return to his office without his story, he often submitted to interviews for which there was no reason other than the reporter’s need. His confidences were often abused and his utterances distorted—if not by the reporter, then by the copy-reader who edited the report for the printers—until he was at last driven to refuse any interviews in self-defense.

There is a class of people, too, who seem to have little or no occupation in life other than seeking the aid of prominent people, their money or their influence, in furthering their own interests. The Doctor was sorely plagued by these. Yet he sought ever to maintain an open door, that no worthy person might be turned away

## 199 / EXCOMMUNICATED

without obtaining a sympathetic ear and such assistance as might be possible and proper.

Applicants for political favors were frequent visitors. There seemed to be a rather widespread belief that the Doctor had considerable influence with the Washington Administration. Several leaders of the United Labor party had received “recognition” by being appointed to minor ministerial positions abroad, but it is unlikely that the Doctor had anything to do with securing these appointments. One of these, a colored clergyman named Thompson, appointed Minister to Haiti, presented the Doctor with a large crayon portrait of himself (the Doctor) which graced the wall of his home for years.

He traveled and lectured extensively, besides holding together his Anti-Poverty Society, which endured without serious defections throughout the period of his excommunication. His returns from these lecture tours were always occasions for family rejoicings. They meant gifts for the children, a sled, a velocipede, various dolls and once a magnificent Newfoundland dog. They frequently meant Sunday excursions, too, for Catholics have ever had a saner idea of what a day of rest means than have Protestants, who in many cases at that time made Sunday a day of torture for their children. The Whelan children appear to have been very well disciplined kiddies indeed, for frequently the Doctor, taking them to ocean beaches or other resorts, would leave them to their own devices while he sought a comfortable place in which to meditate and plan his evening discourse for the Anti-Poverty Society, intepding to keep an eye on them the while, which he did not always do. Indeed, tales are told that on one or two

## 200 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

occasions he forgot that they were with him, but they never forgot him and were ready when he was.

Sometimes he was paid well for his lectures, though most of them were on the

subject nearest his heart, for which he frequently took no more than enough to cover his expenses and in many cases nothing at all. He was the main support of his sister's family during this period, and it is their testimony that money was never very plentiful, and frequently scarce.

A story of one of these lectures told by Henry Ware Allen is typical of many others. Mr. Allen was the treasurer of a Henry George Club in Kansas City, Missouri, which had invited Dr. McGlynn to come all the way from New York to speak at a great meeting, and gave him an honorarium of one hundred dollars. The Doctor counted out fifty dollars, put it in his pocket and handed the other fifty dollars back, saying: "This is enough to cover my expenses. Put the rest of it back in your treasury to help the work."

Repeatedly there came to him the old suggestion that he should found a new church in America. There is little doubt that, in the then existing state of the Catholic mind in this country, he could have created a schism like unto that created by Martin Luther centuries before, and founded a church that would have been a serious if not formidable rival of the Church of Rome. But he always met it with a "Get thee behind me, Satan," spirit, and the repeated assertion that there could be but one Universal Church. He could conceive of no other. There was in him some of the calm wisdom of Erasmus, who saw the same evils that Luther saw, but sought to eradicate them from within the Church.

## 201 / EXCOMMUNICATED

Of course there were occasions when, to escape his thoughts, he resorted to various diversions. One Sunday evening in 1889 he attended a Methodist church to listen to a sermon by a famous preacher. He entered quietly and unobtrusively, almost sneakingly, to escape recognition, but the minister recognized him and, before beginning his sermon, invited him to a seat with him in the pulpit.

On another occasion, hungering for a service in his own Church, he attended mass at a Catholic Church in Brooklyn. There the officiating priest also recognized him, stopped the proceedings and demanded his withdrawal!

One not a Catholic can scarcely believe such a thing possible.

Thus passed the weeks, months and years. When in New York he always addressed the Anti-Poverty Society in person, sometimes sharing the platform with speakers from elsewhere. He never lacked speakers to fill his place when he was absent speaking in other cities. One of the proudest memories of Cornelius Donovan, manufacturer of surgical appliances, who died in 1936, was the fact that on a number of occasions he had substituted for Dr. McGlynn in his absence, and on the walls of his office there hung a beautiful portrait of the Doctor.

These meetings, attended as they were by thousands of Catholics, were a source of great worry to Archbishop Corrigan and other prelates who supported his side of the controversy. Contributions to "Peter's Pence" were declining alarmingly.

On Sunday, January 20, 1889, pursuant to the sug

## 202 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

gestion of Bishop McQuaid in his letter from Rome, there was read in the Catholic Churches of the New York Diocese a letter by Archbishop Corrigan making

attendance at Dr. McGlynn's Anti-Poverty meetings a "reserved case"—that is, suspending the power of the priests of the diocese to give absolution to any Catholics who attended those meetings. The Archbishop based his action on "violent and abusive language habitually employed at these assemblages against the authority of the Holy See and its accredited representatives," and on "Dr. McGlynn's denial of the Church teaching that the right of property is sanctioned by the law of nature."

It was this ambiguous conception and use of the word property" which was at the bottom of the whole controversy, and the Archbishop never was able to get it straight in his mind. Neither Henry George nor Dr. McGlynn ever denied the sanctity of property rights, their contention being that no property wrongs should be allowed to masquerade as property rights.

Dr. McGlynn replied with an open letter to the Archbishop, which was widely published, in which he said:

The doctrines which I have refused to retract are not those condemned by the Pope, but are the teachings of economic science and in full keeping with natural and revealed religion. To retract them would be treason to truth and conscience. The mistaken interference against them by ecclesiastical officials can only result, as opposition to the Copernican system and the struggles of nations for liberty, unity and independence has resulted, to the discredit of their dogmatic teaching and of their administrative authority. . .

Catholic theology teaches that there can be no reserved

## 203 / EXCOMMUNICATED

case without grievous sin, and that it is not in the power of a bishop to make, by his declaration, a reserved case of what is not a grievous sin. Catholics may, therefore, attend our meetings without the slightest violation of their conscience, and can receive absolution from any of the priests of their diocese without confessing such attendance; they can resent as an impertinence any question on the subject; and the priests of their diocese can refrain from questioning them about attendance at our meetings and can give absolution to persons who have admitted such attendance.

The Archbishop's letter had little of the effect he desired and none whatever on those Catholics who understood and approved Dr. McGlynn's position. Some of them sought absolution in Brooklyn, Jersey City and other places outside Archbishop Corrigan's jurisdiction, and some went without it, consoling themselves with the reflection that, if the Doctor could do so with a clear conscience, they could do likewise.

The meetings continued, and people who deemed themselves good Catholics continued to attend them. And all this continued to worry the Archbishop. Wherefore in February, 1890, he called a meeting of priests in the Cathedral in New York to ascertain their opinions on three propositions. These propositions, set forth in Latin, were thus translated by the *New York Herald*:

Albertus, a man imbued with the principles of the moderate Socialists, believes he has a right to attend meetings in which the property of individuals in land is attacked. He is advised by a friend, an excellent Catholic, that he is in serious danger. He answers that he is doing no wrong,

## 204 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

since the matter is merely political and beyond the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical authority.

However, to please his friend, he goes to two confessors. The first to whom he goes utterly condemns him, both because of the doctrine which he maintained and also because of the "reserved case" which is incurred by those who attend the above mentioned meetings.

He is received more mildly by the second confessor. The latter tries to persuade Albertus that he should not make himself conspicuous in the defense of the doctrine which certain people cavil at because they do not understand it, and also that he should avoid these meetings, not that he has not the right to attend them, but that for the sake of peace and to avoid giving offense to weaker brethren he should not do so.

The question is, first, what opinion shall we hold concerning the conduct of Albertus and the reasons alleged by him? Second, what judgment must we pass upon the answers of the two confessors?

The propositions and questions were aimed at Catholics who still attended the meetings held by Dr. McGlynn. They opened the question of whether a Catholic could attend meetings held by an excommunicated priest and remain a Catholic. They also, whether Archbishop Corrigan realized it or not, opened again the question of the right of a Roman Catholic bishop to interfere in American politics, to control the politics of Catholics.

This meeting of priests proved a "dud," for it brought forth nothing startling. It was denied that the supposititious case was made to fit the attendants at the McGlynn meetings. It was stated that for ages the Church has recognized property in land as just, and

## 205 / EXCOMMUNICATED

had itself accumulated property in land. It was also stated that the Church had never specifically denounced the doctrine which denies the justice of property in land. The law of Moses and the prophets regarding property in land "forever" or "in perpetuity" was not brought into the discussion, except by Dr. McGlynn and his friends.

The Archbishop decided that those who attended these meetings were in "mortal sin," made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and from Jerusalem wrote a letter to the Doctor, of which more anon.

It is of record that Dr. McGlynn, with a number of his friends, attended the first National Single Tax Conference, held in Cooper Union, New York, in 1890. They entered the hall while Edward Osgood Brown of Chicago was speaking. A part of the audience rose to welcome them, and there were scattered cries for the Doctor. He and his party found seats, and Mr. Brown continued his address. The Doctor was not invited to take part in the proceedings, however, and he and Henry George do not appear to have met. Whether the breach between the two was narrowed or widened by the incident is difficult to say. Mr. George cannot be blamed for not making the first advance, for the Doctor had used some exceedingly harsh

language two years before in expressing himself on what he had regarded as George's "desertion of the cause."