CHAPTER III

DEPENDENCE OF THE PULPIT

Even though Privilege control the press and the university, what hope for empire over men's thoughts unless it gain the moral sanction?

For in all the relations of man to himself or to his Maker the question arises: Is it right? In all his relations toward his fellows he inwardly asks: Is it just?

Privilege is not just, for to be just means to be even, equal; to conform to natural, unchanging law. Privilege is an advantage. It means unevenness, inequality. It represents a human act of favor bestowed on one and refused another.

But Privilege desires to have itself called just; or at least it strives to avoid being called unjust. Aiming to control the teaching of morality, it follows the course pursued with the university: it becomes patron. It sits high in the temple. It makes large gifts. It raises shrines of splendor and grandeur in praise and thanksgiving. It sends missionaries to preach the word of faith to the benighted in remote parts.

And since the clergy are only men, who, in common with most other men, find it difficult under present social adjustments to get a living and be independent, they do what other men do — take the line of least resistance —

Finding first  
What may be, then find how to make it fair
Up to our means.

For reduced to dependence, the clergy must defer to the patron. What this means Adam Smith showed —
century and a quarter ago in the case of the Church of England.

Under such a government the clergy naturally endeavor to recommend themselves to the sovereign, to the court, to the nobility and the gentry of the country, by whose influence they chiefly expect to obtain preference. They pay court to those patrons, sometimes, no doubt, by the vilest flattery and assentation, but frequently, too, by cultivating all those arts which best deserve, and which are therefore most likely to gain them the esteem of people of rank and fortune; by their knowledge in all the different branches of useful and ornamental learning, by the decent liberality of their manners, by the social good-humor of their conversation, and by their avowed contempt for those absurd and hypocritical austerities which fanatics inculcate and pretend to practice. . . . Such a clergy, however, while they pay their court in this manner to the higher ranks of life, are very apt to neglect altogether the means of maintaining their influence and authority with the lower. They are listened to, esteemed and respected by their superiors; but before their inferiors they are frequently incapable of defending, effectually and to the conviction of such hearers, their own sober and moderate doctrines against the most ignorant enthusiast who chooses to attack them.¹

There is no Established Church in this country and no body of our clergy is dependent upon the political powers in the way described by Adam Smith. But the receivers of government favors constitute a privileged class. And it is from that class that the clergy "chiefly expect to obtain preference." It is to them that the clergy "pay court."

"There was a time," said Dr. Falkner, rector-emeritus of Christ Church, Germantown, in a sermon at the opening session of the convention of the diocese of Pennsylvania, "when the poor came to the Episcopal churches seeking and obtaining aid for body and soul, and felt that they were helped through its ministers. Is this so today?" Dr. Falkner had to confess that there are churches in which "the presence of the poor is regarded as bad form. If Christ Himself were to enter them, the pew openers would ask: What is that carpenter doing here?"

"That this is true of some of the Episcopal churches "in practice if not in theory," says The Churchman, "and not

in Philadelphia alone, the observant church-goer will find himself constrained regretfully to admit. The spirit is not dead yet of which Bishop Potter gave the other day a curious illustration in his reminiscence of an old-time sexton of Grace Church, who, when taken to task for ordering a poorly dressed woman from one of the pews, replied, "Why, if we permit that, they’ll soon be praying all over the place!" 1

*The Churchman* thinks that if that spirit is not dead, "it is dying." Yet no explanation is made as to why or how it is dying. *The Churchman* frankly says that "as society is organized to-day, there cannot but be distinctions of class. These arise inevitably from differences in education, opportunity, occupation, race." The word "opportunity" would suffice to explain class distinctions. Those who possess natural opportunities must have great advantages over those who have them not. The difference is as between abundance and scarcity. But do the churches preach equality of opportunity? Here and there, yes. But they are as voices in a wilderness. The generality of the churches not only do not; they avoid the subject as a lion in the way. The celebrated case of Dr. Edward McGlynn of New York shows how the thorns and brambles must strew the path of him who undertakes in the organized denominations to open the way for others to preach the gospel of equal opportunity to God's bounties.

In October, 1886, Dr. Edward McGlynn, pastor of St. Stephen's Catholic Church in New York, and acknowledged to be one of the most scholarly and eloquent preachers in the city, was forbidden by the superior of his diocese, Archbishop Corrigan, from participating in a certain political meeting. Whether the archbishop did this of his own volition, or at the behest of certain powerful special interests that took fright at the priest's utterances lest their interests be hurt, has never been made clear. The archbishop assigned as the chief reason for his action that

1 Editorial, "What is that Carpenter doing Here?" May 13, 1905.
the meeting was intended to promote principles that were "unsound, unsafe and contrary to the teachings of the Church." The heart of those principles was that God Almighty had made the earth for the equal enjoyment of all his children, and not to become the private and exclusive property of some. Dr. McGlynn replied to his ecclesiastical superior that these principles were not contrary to the teachings of the Church, and that, since he had been announced, he could not refrain from speaking at the meeting consistently with his own respect and without publicly renouncing the rights of an American citizen. And speak he did, with a consequence of being temporarily suspended from his priestly duties.

Later the archbishop issued a pastoral letter to be read in all the Catholic churches of the diocese condemning "certain unsound principles and theories which assailed the right of property." Dr. McGlynn's name was not mentioned, but every one perceived that the principles repudiated were those which the St. Stephen's pastor had publicly avowed. Dr. McGlynn thereupon gave an interview to the New York Tribune, carefully repeating his views. For this he suffered a further suspension at the hands of the archbishop, who at the same time procured a cable message from the Prefect of the Propaganda, Cardinal Simeoni, ordering Dr. McGlynn to repair instantly to Rome; "not to be complimented," said Vicar-General Preston, but "to be disciplined." Dr. McGlynn declined to go, and again he stated his "doctrine about land," saying:—

I have taught, and I shall continue to teach in speeches and writings as long as I live, that land is rightfully the property of the people in common, and that private ownership of land is against natural justice, no matter by what civil or ecclesiastical laws it may be sanctioned; and I would bring about instantly, if I could, such change of laws all the world over as would confiscate private property in land, without one penny of compensation to the miscalled owners.

The archbishop thereupon published a cable message which his presentation of the matter had procured from
Cardinal Simeoni directing him to "give orders to have Dr. McGlynn again invited to proceed to Rome and also to condemn in writing the doctrines to which he has given utterance in public meetings or which have been attributed to him in the press."

Dr. McGlynn, still refusing to recant or to go to Rome to be "disciplined," was on July 3, 1887, excommunicated. Several other priests in the diocese who failed to give outward sign of disapproval of the McGlynn utterances were punished by transference, among them perhaps the most distinguished Catholic ecclesiastical jurist in the United States, Rev. Dr. Richard L. Burtell, who had been Dr. McGlynn's legal adviser. He was deprived of his church in New York City and was sent to the little Church of St. Mary's at Rondout, on the Hudson River.

But though forbidden to perform the priestly duties, Dr. McGlynn cherished the old saying, "Once a priest, always a priest." He made Sunday night addresses on the land question in Cooper Union, before the Anti-Poverty Society, of which he was president and of which a large part of his St. Stephen's parishioners were members; and the land doctrine, instead of losing, steadily gained believers.

Five years later, when Pope Leo XIII sent Archbishop (now Cardinal) Satolli to this country as his special representative, the latter, presumably following instructions, re-opened Dr. McGlynn's case. He first accepted from Dr. McGlynn's counsel, Dr. Burtell, an exposition of the McGlynn doctrine. At suggestion of the apostolic delegate, Dr. McGlynn himself also presented a brief exposition in writing in the precise terms in which he had been preaching it. This paper was submitted by the delegate to a committee of four of the professors of the Catholic University at Washington and was by them unanimously pronounced to contain nothing contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church. The ban of excommunication was therupon removed, and next day, Christmas, 1892,
Dr. McGlynn, for the first time in more than five years, celebrated mass. In the evening he delivered his usual address on the land question before the Anti-Poverty Society at Cooper Union.

Moreover, Archbishop Corrigan was directed to assign Dr. McGlynn a church. The one selected by the New York prelate was St. Mary's in the little town of Newburgh on the Hudson, like that, and close to that, assigned Dr. Burtsell. Dr. McGlynn quietly and faithfully performed the duties of his priestly office at St. Mary's until his death in 1900, although whenever occasion seemed to require it, and notably at the funeral of his intimate friend, Henry George, he issued forth to preach the doctrine that the land was made for all men equally and not to become the exclusive property of some. And as a further proof that special interests can no longer bring sufficient influence to put the Catholic Church's seal of condemnation on this doctrine, Dr. Burtsell has recently received special honors from the new Pope, Pius X, who has made him a monsignor.

Archbishop Corrigan, who had condemned Dr. McGlynn's "unsound principles" relative to "property," and who had pronounced them to be "contrary to the teachings of the Church," was completely reversed and signal rebuked. Yet it is probable that but for the really world-wide sympathy and encouragement Dr. McGlynn's case excited — covertly from the priesthood, openly from the laity — it might never, despite the indisputably brilliant services of Dr. Burtsell, have appeared important enough, against the presentations of the Archiepiscopal Palace in New York, to reopen. It was a great victory, primarily because of the magnificent courage of Dr. McGlynn in facing what seemed to be utter and irreparable personal disaster and in holding fast, without compromise or equivocation, to what he believed to be a fundamental truth — the very cornerstone truth of civilization. The superb heroism of that act and the obvious righteousness of the
doctrine for which he was called upon to suffer expulsion
and public disgrace together produced a tide of sentiment
that nothing could withstand. Privilege, in the persons
of certain of the hierarchy and laity of New York who had
denounced Dr. McGlynn's teachings and had held him
up to the world as an "unfrocked priest," was overborne.

But if this decisive triumph has come out of the remark-
able McGlynn struggle, other victories have yet to be won
on other questions and in other denominations. Even in
respect to so palpable and immediate an evil as political
corruption, the clergy of the country too generally "pay
their court to the higher ranks of life." The Churchman
of New York (Episcopal) furnishes an illustration of this:

Recently, when Dr. Newman Smythe of Connecticut sought to
arouse the conscience of the people of that State to the character
and extent of the political corruption which it was proposed to reward
by a seat in the United States Senate, he was left to fight his fight
almost alone, neither church nor press lending him efficient aid. . . .
It is not the foreign immigrants nor the poor and landless city
voters who are at the bottom of this public brigandage, but the
native-born, property-holding Americans, precisely that class which
constitutes the clientele of the churches. 1

A daily newspaper relates the distressing story of Rhode
Island's "gagged and bound" clergy. "The taking of
bribes," says the correspondent, "is not looked upon as a
crime by some leading church workers and men of sub-
stance in the country. For this reason the pastor, unless
he wishes to terminate abruptly his career of usefulness,
is bound to defer to the sentiment of the community. Take
the case of the big mill towns. No country clergyman
can afford to offend the mill owner, who is in a large sense
his patron and on whom, in some degree, his livelihood
depends."

And who that has been through the hard coal regions
of Pennsylvania has not found the clergy there, taking
them generally, modern examples of the chaplains and

confessors of the predatory barons of old? It was formerly the practice in the anthracite fields for the operator to deduct a percentage of the men’s wages for “religion.” The operator divided the aggregate sum in proportion to the respective faiths of the men, but practically selected the minister in each denomination to receive the money. If, with the passing of the old-style petty autocrats from the anthracite regions and the coming in their place of the great companies, the dispensing of stipends out of the miner’s earnings has all but ceased, the bondage of the clergy to the “coal owners” is no less real and deadening.

Nor is the bondage different in its effects in other places. Wherever Privilege rears its head it seeks the moral sanction. It desires and obtains the benefit of clergy. Sydney Smith declared that the theological divisions sought by the Bishop of Peterborough could best be shown by mapping England in colors as the geologist does to indicate differences in the earth’s formation. How well this might be adapted to present the dependent condition of the clergy in certain parts of the United States: black for the livery of the coal interests; dark red for the iron ore; blue for steel; brown for timber; checkered for railroad; peach-blossom pink or robin’s-egg blue for the tribe of fashionable pastors who, in eloquent periods, prate to the monopoly-made rich of righteousness and justice, but omit any mention of how monopoly robs the poor.

At a meeting not long since in New York State, of a Southern educational society, a Protestant Episcopal bishop spoke up in deprecation of the caution in expenditures some one advised in fear of an early financial crisis in this country. “The country to-day,” said he, “is in the hands of a dozen capitalists who control affairs, and who, as a matter of self-protection, will prevent any calamity!” Apparently the bishop spoke figuratively, for there is no such concentration of wealth and power as his words describe. Yet even in this sense had he anything to say in disapprobation of a state of things so opposite to the
theory of our Government—a Government of, by and for the people, and not, as his remark implied, by and for "a dozen capitalists"? He said nothing about this.

"Things are not so bad," remarks a newspaper, "as when Wesley complained that one man would not listen to him for fear of hearing something against cock-fighting, yet the reluctance of our preachers to touch their most influential parishioners on the raw is proverbial."

Does this explain why, when, not long since, two hundred ministers of various Protestant denominations gathered in Holy Trinity Church, in Philadelphia, to petition the Almighty to redeem the city from political corruption, no part of that prayer, or of the addresses that preceded or followed it, even alluded to the powerful public franchise corporations that bought and paid for that corruption in order to rule and rob the city and its people? These clergymen knew whence came the corruption funds, the campaign "dough," the bribe money. The very school child knew that. Yet not one minister among them spoke up and said that civic rule was rotten because this railroad company, that traction company, such-and-such lighting system and so-and-so telephone corporation—the names of which all could give—were putting contamination into the civic blood. Two months later, when a gas franchise steal of unprecedented audacity shook the public from its lethargy into a tumult of indignation, these clergymen rushed in and helped kill the project; but they stirred not until the general population was surcharged with excitement.

True some, like Blougram, may

... have a soul and body that exact
A comfortable care in many ways.

Others are like a distinguished Methodist preacher, now bishop, who, called to officiate at the funeral ceremonies over the heir of a Western railroad king, compared the youth alive to the boy Christ. Or like the Presbyterian
doctor of divinity, who, over the body of one of the worst political corruptionists Pennsylvania ever knew, calmly declared that the deceased "was always on the right side of every moral question." Or, like the Unitarian minister, who, delivering an oration in the United States Senate-chamber beside the casket of a man who had become Senator by sheer bribery and who had boasted that he carried the "larger business methods" into national politics, eulogized this "whole-souled child of God who believed in success and who knew how to succeed by using the infinite powers."

There are others, many others, who resemble Bishop Hopkins of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Vermont, who just before the Civil War was one of those who quoted the scriptures to uphold slavery: —

"Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. . . . If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve, and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself; if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters, the wife and children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife and my children; I will not go out free: then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or to the door post, and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever."

And then said this Vermont bishop of fifty years ago: —

Where was the sin of holding them in slavery? When the Almighty commanded His people to buy and own the posterity of the heathen, was it a sin to obey Him? And how could that which He commanded be a crime against morality? Where is the "law" which is "higher" than the code laid down by the Deity? Where is the rule of morals which shall claim supremacy over the Word of God?  

But none of these things can be said of the great part of those teachers of morality who fail to be bold against the master evils of to-day. They simply realize their dependent position. This makes them silent about things which otherwise it would be their first aim to arraign. They reason that if they are to be of any help to mankind they must not antagonize those special interests which will contribute liberally toward that part of the moral work as to which there may be no dispute. And so the body of the clergy holds its peace.

This raises what The Evangelical Messenger (Cleveland, Ohio) calls a “knotty problem of casuistry.” Yet it probably was what caused the Prudential Committee of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Congregational) to solicit and accept the famous $100,000 contribution of Mr. John D. Rockefeller. Against the storm of criticism from independent clergymen this action produced, the committee said merely that “to prevent a man from doing good is a wrong way in which to condemn him for doing evil. It is as wrong to condemn him when he is doing a good deed as not to condemn him for doing a bad deed.” Baptist, Methodist and other denominational bodies took virtually the same stand. They said in substance that it was not their business, as ministers of the Christian gospel, to inquire whence comes the money, but simply to consider in what way the most good can be done when they get it.

To that resolve Dr. Washington Gladden, moderator of the Council of the Congregational Church, cries with icy irony: “No discrimination is henceforth to be made. The pirate or train robber may bring his booty . . . and it will be thankfully received; and if sufficiently large it will be described as a ‘magnificent gift’!” Says Dr. Josiah Strong of the same denomination, “One has no right to accept a gift which the donor has no right to give.”

“‘But,” retorts the other side, “all this implies that Mr. Rockefeller had no legal right to gather his money as he
did, which is unjust to him. He was within the statutes. There was no law against rebates when he commenced their use.” Mr. Henry H. Rogers, Mr. Rockefeller’s associate in the Standard Oil Company, puts the matter in specific terms: “Slavery in certain sections of the United States was legal until President Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation. Rebates on railroads were just as legal until the passage of the Inter-State Commerce Commission Act.”

While it is true, as a daily paper caustically remarks, that “Mr. Rogers simply shows that his moral vision is bounded, east, west, north and south, by the penal code,” it may also be said that Mr. Rockefeller’s use of the railroad rebate made a prohibitory law necessary. Before that the rebate was legal negatively. There was no statute, and no thought of a statute, against it. But in his hands it became a club to beat out the brains of competitors. Congress then had to declare it unlawful. Witness the contract between the Standard Oil Company and the Pennsylvania Railroad, October 17, 1877. In that instrument the Standard Oil Company, by William Rockefeller, vice-president, accepts a ten per cent. “commission [rebate] provided that no other shipper of oil by your line shall pay less than the rate fixed for us before such rate is deducted.” The Standard contracted for a fixed low rate for itself, but a fixed high rate for its competitors over the privately owned public highway!

Moreover, as Dr. Gladden has observed: —

Mr. Rockefeller and his doings have felt more than once the heavy censure of the courts of law. Again and again in the legal tribunals of Ohio and the United States his business methods have been denounced. In 1892 the Supreme Court of Ohio dissolved by a decree the Standard Oil Trust, which had been doing business for ten years, and had amassed several great fortunes. The language of the court was: “Its object was to establish a virtual monopoly

1 Statement to the press, March 31, 1905.
of the business of producing petroleum, and of manufacturing, refining and dealing in it and all its products, throughout the entire country, and by which it might not merely control the production, but the price, at its pleasure. All such associations are contrary to the policy of our State, and are void."

"Great heavens!" Rev. Artemus Jean Hayes of New Haven exclaims in a sermon, "is there nothing certain in this world until some court of law has passed upon it? Even among lawyers is there not such a thing as *prima facie* evidence?" And then comes the *New York Evening Post* with the dissecting knife: —

An endowment of scientific research, for example, might be taken without demur from a criminal rich man. Microbes can be hunted for with money that has not been disinfected. So, too, it might fairly be argued that a hospital or asylum or trade school or geographical expedition could be financed by a man whose ways of making money would not bear inspection by the moralist — or even by the grand jury. With colleges and universities we reach most dubious ground. A gift to education by a man whose career is a glorification of piracy may instantly undo the moral teaching of those who profit by it; but, on the other hand, the foundation may become deodorized by the lapse of time, as have the pious mediaval gifts to education by oppressors and robbers, and hence it may be a nice question whether college trustees should neglect such an opportunity to build for the future. But when we enter the Christian church, the ground wherein we stand is holy, and all the excuses with which men may be shod elsewhere should be put off their feet. . . . "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way: first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Imagine the long line of brothers who have aught against Mr. Rockefeller!  

The early Fathers of the Christian Church had clear things to say on this head and they said them. Lecture 6 of Book IV of the Apostolic Constitutions, which are at least fourteen hundred years old, treats of the question,

---

1 *The Outlook*, April 22, 1905.
2 Editorial, March 22, 1905. In a subsequent issue appeared a letter to the editor signed "An American Woman," who told of a business woman who gets her "best" orders from prostitutes, but who "contributes liberally to the church."
"Whose oblations are to be received and whose not to be received." In this straightforward way the word is given:

Now the bishop ought to know whose oblations he ought to receive, and whose he ought not. For he is to avoid corrupt dealers, and not to receive their gifts. "For a corrupt dealer shall not be justified from sin" (Ecclus. xxvi. 29). . . . He is also to avoid extortioners and such as covet other men's goods, and adulterers; for the sacrifices of such as these are abominable with God. Also those that oppress the widow and overbear the orphan, and fill prisons with the innocent, and abuse their own servants wickedly, I mean with stripes and hunger and hard service, may destroy whole cities; do thou, O bishop, avoid such as these and their odious oblations. Thou shalt also refuse rogues, and such lawyers that plead on the side of injustice, and idol makers, and thieves, and unjust publicans, and those that deceive by false balances and deceitful measures . . . and every one that is wicked and opposes the will of God . . . . For those that receive from such persons, and thereby support the widows and orphans, shall be obnoxious to the judgment-seat of God . . . . For the bread which is distributed to the widows from labor is better, though it be short and little, than that from injustice and false accusation, though it be much and fine.¹

Is it because there are what Professor E. A. Ross calls "new varieties of sin," the "tropical belt of sin we are now sweeping into" being "largely impersonal" and impossible of discernment, that clergymen come forward in such evident good faith as that manifested by Rev. John Hutchins, of Litchfield, Conn., to assure the world of the simple Christian life Mr. Rockefeller lives; or that causes Rev. Dr. R. S. MacArthur of New York to declare that "the coarse, cruel and perhaps criminal criticisms of Mr. John D. Rockefeller have maligned the entire Baptist denomination"?

Be these things as they may and also be it true or otherwise that Mr. Rockefeller has broken State or United States statutes — all such matters fade into insignificance beside the question of political economy involved. "Given the railway and economic conditions, the progress of the

Standard Oil Company was quite inevitable," says Mr. Gilbert Holland Montague in his "Rise and Progress of the Standard Oil Company," the book which Mr. Rockefeller is reported to have sent gratuitously to a large part of the clergy of the country. To admit the premises is to accept the conclusion. For what else can follow if the oil lands can be made private property, and public highways (railroads and pipe lines) can be made private possessions? It only needs a genius for organization, coupled with a nature bereft of mercy, to carry everything before it.

But it is blasphemy of the worst kind to call this the work of God Almighty. Mr. Rockefeller, nevertheless, implies that it is; and President Baer of the Anthracite Coal Combination is reported to have said: "God in His infinite wisdom has given the business interests of the country" into the hands of certain "Christian men" who will take care of every one else. But in what manner shall this care be bestowed? Does young Mr. Rockefeller—John D. Rockefeller, Jr.,—explain? He gave his Bible class at the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church in New York a parable, presumably to make clear economic conditions: "The American Beauty rose," said he, "can be produced in all its glory only by sacrificing the early buds that grow up around it!"

"In his economic argument," scornfully replied Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis, of Brooklyn (Congregational), "this young man tells the working classes brutally that 999 businesses must be snipped off in order to produce one American Beauty, namely, his trust." Rev. Herbert S. Johnson, of Boston (Baptist), came closer to the bone in remarking that "the Church's failing popularity with laboring men is due in large measure to her reputation for economic injustice." Rev. Thomas A. Ducey, of New York (Catholic), touched the very marrow in saying that "no organization of wealth may corner the bounties of nature and escape unscathed." But does the Christian Church generally say these things? Alas, it does not.
For there are givers of oblations who have acquired great wealth by means contrary to the laws. These may, in seasons of great excitement, be arraigned and chastened. But there are other and larger givers who enjoy legal and social sanction, whose process of heaping up is, nevertheless, in utter conflict with morals, since it is through possession of government-made advantages, which work injustice by taking from the many much that is rightfully theirs. Why decry Mr. Rockefeller's use of the rebate, if he may without question possess the railroad and the pipe line, both properly public highways? Why charge Mr. Rockefeller with acts of tyranny or villany in the producing and refining fields, if he have full warrant to monopolize the oil-bearing soil? If the one thing is wrong, surely the other and larger is wrong also. If it is wrong, it is against morals. If it is against morals, it is the duty of teachers of morals to condemn and denounce. Some do, but how can the many, when the Nobles of Privilege are the chief patrons of the Church and have an overmastering influence?