
Henry George and 'Rerum Novarum': Evidence Is Scant That the American Economist Was a Target of Leo XIII's Classic Encyclical

Author(s): C. Joseph Nuesse

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Apr., 1985, Vol. 44, No. 2 (Apr., 1985), pp. 241-254

Published by: American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3486845>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*

JSTOR

Henry George and 'Rerum Novarum':

Evidence Is Scant that the American Economist Was a Target of Leo XIII's Classic Encyclical

By C. JOSEPH NUESSE*

ABSTRACT. Students of the life and thought of *Henry George* have accepted too readily his own opinion, expressed in the *Open Letter* that he addressed to *Pope Leo XIII* in 1891, that the Pope's epoch-making encyclical *Rerum novarum* was aimed at *Georgism*. The disposition of the *Open Letter* in Vatican circles remains obscure, perhaps because the *Holy Office* had so recently decided that George's works were deserving of condemnation. But there is documentary support for only an allusion to George's views on *property* in the *encyclical*. Nor can the reinstatement of *Father Edward McGlynn* and the reappraisal of George that it signaled be attributed to the *Open Letter*. George's views may have had significant indirect influence, however, through (1) national land reform movements insofar as they affected the course of *Catholic social thought*, and (2) the discussion of *Georgism* as a form of *socialism*. These possibilities need to be investigated.

I

WHEN HENRY GEORGE undertook to address Pope Leo XIII on the subject of the encyclical letter, *Rerum novarum* (On the Condition of Labor), he remarked ruefully to His Holiness that "its most strikingly pronounced condemnations are directed against a theory that we who hold it know to be deserving of your support."¹ He was, as his principal biographer has noted, "an admirer of Roman Catholicism, and yet an extreme and effective critic of bishops and pope."² There was much in the encyclical that he could endorse. He recognized that "by so conspicuously calling attention to the condition of labor" the pope had "recalled the fact forgotten by so many that the social evils and problems of our time directly and pressingly concern the Church."³ He must have been keenly mindful, however, that four years earlier his most ardent disciple in New York, Father Edward McGlynn, had incurred excom-

* [C. Joseph Nuesse, Ph.D., is professor of sociology emeritus and provost emeritus of the Catholic University of America, Washington D.C. 20064.] A travel grant from the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation facilitated the research in the Secret Archives of the Vatican and the Archives of the Sacred Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples (the "Propaganda Fide") on which this paper is based. Its substance was presented to a symposium on "Father McGlynn and Henry George" at the Henry George Institute, New York, on November 5, 1983.

American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 44, No. 2 (April, 1985).

© 1985 American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

4
S. CONGREGAZIONE DI PROPAGANDA FIDE

N. 1753 di Protocollo.

Oggetto

64 - C - 4

Roma die 1. Aprilis 1889

(Sub secreto S. Officii)

Bene ac R. e Domine mi obsequia

Libri in vulgus editi ab Henrico Georgio examini Supremae Congregationis S. R. et Universalis Inquisitionis fer. IV. die 6 Februarii 1889 subiecti fuerunt, mihiq[ue] demandatum, ut significarem Eminentiae tuae eisdem damnatione dignos inventos fuisse. Attentes tamen peculiaribus temporum et locorum circumstantiis, et habita praesertim ratione zeli ac sollicitudinis, qua omnes sacrorum Antistites istius Reipublicae vigilant, ut fideles eorum curae committunt, ab erroribus qui circumferuntur, serventur immunes; Etenim Patres Generales Inquisitores a condemnatione evulganda supersedendum censuerunt. Omnino enim confident, istarum regionum Episcopos una beaurum industriam ac diligentiam esse adhiburos, ut quae catholica Ecclesia de privatae proprietatis iure, vel si ad terram respiciat, perpetuo docuit et plene definit, ac novissimis etiam temporibus per Summos Pontifices Pium IX, Litteris Encyclicis Qui pluribus, et Pium D. N.

Emo ac Rmo Dno

Cardinali Jacobo Gibbons

Archiepiscopo Baltimorensi

Favos secreto numerum procedenti.
On prie de noter le nombre procedent.

Leonem XIII, Litteris pariter Encyclicis Quod Apostolici muneris, inculcavit, fideles ac potissimum ecclesiastici viri, nulla eorum admixtione, retineant, atque a falsis theoriis, quae ea super re Henricus Georgius venditat, sibi caveant.

Haec cum Suffraganeis Tuis, communicabis, sub secreto tamen S. Officii, ne in vulgus manent, simulque eidem significabis, Supremam Congregationem, quando agitur de sana doctrina integre servanda, in cognita eorum sedulitate ac pastoralis vigilantiae conquirere. mihi modo nihil aliud superest, nisi ut impensos obsequii mei sensus tester Eminentiae Tuae cui manus humillime deosculor.

Datum Romae, ex aed. S. C. de Prop. Fide die 9 Aprilis 1889.

Eminentiae Tuae

*Humilissimus Societatis Sacerdotum
Joannes Franc. Simeoni, Praef. S. C.*

J. D. Archib. Gibbons

Figure 1

The official notification to Cardinal James Gibbons of Baltimore of the action of the Holy Office on February 6, 1889 condemning Henry George's theories. It is contained in a letter dated April 9, 1889 from Cardinal Giovanni Simeoni, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The decision of the Holy Office was communicated to that Congregation because it then had jurisdiction over the American church (the United States was classified as a "missionary country" until 1908). In this letter Cardinal Gibbons is asked to communicate to his suffragan bishops, under obligation of secrecy, that the books of Henry George were considered deserving of condemnation, but the Holy Office was refraining from a public condemnation, trusting the American bishops to maintain pastoral vigilance in the matter. The Holy Office's unusual action reflected the division in the American and English hierarchy over the issue, some bishops, notably Archbishop Michael Corrigan of New York and Bishop Bernard McQuaid of Rochester, promoting the decision and others, notably Cardinals Gibbons and Manning and Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, opposing it. The grounds for the action are stated as George's "false theories" of private property, opposed to Catholic teaching as outlined in the encyclical letters *Qui pluribus* of Pope Pius IX, and *Quod Apostolici muneris* of Pope Leo XIII, both of which deal with socialism. [From the Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore.]

munication for his assistance to Georgism in defiance of his archbishop. What would have been his thought if he had known, as he probably never learned, that only two years earlier his own works had been reviewed at the Holy See and, in an unpublished decision by the Holy Office, had been found “worthy of condemnation”?⁴ (See Figure 1.)

According to the son, when *Rerum novarum* was issued the father remarked bluntly, “I regard the encyclical letter as aimed at us, and at us alone, almost. And I feel very much encouraged by the honor.”⁵ Almost immediately he wrote to his Irish friend in the priesthood, Father Thomas Dawson, O.M.I., that he was distressed at the import of the papal document. Both George and his son found confirmation of his assumption about the Pope’s intent in the son’s understanding of the remark of Cardinal Henry Edward Manning of Westminster that the common ownership of land appeared to be condemned in the encyclical.⁶

George’s conviction that the encyclical was directed mostly at the movement that he had initiated was certainly overdrawn. In spite of the lack of documentary support for it, however, it seems to have gained somewhat uncritical acceptance even among those who have ventured to suggest that George may have been only “more than half right.”⁷ It does not matter much that some contemporary ecclesiastics agreed “gleefully” that the encyclical was directed against Georgism.⁸ An application of its teachings to condemn Henry George’s theories and proposals was no proof of its formulation for the purpose. But as early as 1899, a German land reformer was reporting that the encyclical had been directed against George’s theory.⁹ Later the most systematic Georgian analyst thus far found that in the encyclical “the doctrines attacked are labelled ‘socialistic’, but they are essentially those of George.”¹⁰ Even Barker, somewhat more reserved than most other commentators on this point, became persuaded that “the Henry George evidence does seem to indicate that not Karl Marx the materialist but a disturbing American idealist had been the great enemy in ideas, at whom Pope Leo was striking.”¹¹

Fortunately, Barker could also acknowledge a “suspicion of megalomania in Henry George’s hot individual reaction to a document drawn up for universal reading and guidance.”¹² When the encyclical was being drafted—and much earlier, for that matter—the various Catholic social movements on the Continent were posing urgent questions of the industrial age.¹³ Some of the theoretical issues that were debated in these movements and in Rome, such as corporatism, would have been unfamiliar to Americans, even to American prelates. On the other hand, from the United States as well as from

other countries, there were requests "not only in favor of the poor but for judgment of the economic structures responsible for the proletarianization of the workers."¹⁴

The only documentary citation given to support the claims mentioned is that of a recent student who admits that the relationship of the curial judgment upon George's writings to the papal encyclical is far from clear. But he nevertheless finds in petitions for an authoritative statement on private property that Cardinal James Gibbons of Baltimore addressed to the Holy Father an indication that such a relationship was real.¹⁵ Although Gibbons and others presented such petitions to the Pope during 1888, in the wake of the controversies aroused by Georgism,¹⁶ and although Gibbons' successful effort to prevent a condemnation of the Knights of Labor was even hailed by one of the pope's most trusted scholars as "perhaps the one to determine definitely the Pope's attitude" toward labor organization,¹⁷ the effect of the petitions was not as direct as seems to be implied. It was rather an instance in which "the Church in the United States did not present a program of social thought, but its problem of Catholic participation in the Knights of Labor combined with the further obscurity of the land issue to act as one of the world events which stimulated Rome to action."¹⁸

The recent work of Silagi does not cite what is to date the most direct evidence of advertence to Georgism during the preparation of the encyclical. This evidence would not have been available to Geiger and Barker. It is to be found in a footnote in an unusually complete account of the drafting of the encyclical that is based upon the manuscripts of the drafts and the detailed notes kept at the time by the private secretary of Pope Leo.¹⁹ The footnote indicates that an allusion to Henry George's theories was intended in the passage which reads as follows:

These arguments [for private ownership of property] are so strong and convincing that it seems surprising that certain obsolete opinions should now be revived in opposition to what is here laid down. We are told that it is right for private persons to have the use of the soil and the fruits of their land, but that it is unjust for any one to possess as owner either the land on which he has built or the estate which he has cultivated.²⁰

It is not difficult to accept the indication of the allusion, although the same footnote mistakenly attributes to the American bishops collectively the denunciation of George's works to the Holy See. Only Archbishop Michael A. Corrigan of New York and a few others had made the representations in question. The opposition of Gibbons to a formal condemnation is correctly noted.²¹

II

ALTHOUGH THE PRESENT AUTHOR'S CONCERN is with documentary evidence of George's influence, the limitations of the data that are available prompt the suggestion that research extending beyond the question of the text is required. Two channels of the probable influence of George's works upon late 19th century Catholic social movements would seem to be especially deserving of study. They can only be mentioned in passing, but students might find that through them Georgism had significant, albeit indirect, effects.

In the first place, Henry George's ideas and in some instances his personal participation affected the various national land reform movements in Europe as well as in the United States.²² These need to be examined carefully for indications of their influence upon the development of Catholic social thinking both within their respective national contexts and within curial circles in Rome. Although *Rerum novarum* was intended to address developments in the advancing industrialism of the time in the light of traditional Catholic teaching, its text, like virtually any other on a controversial subject, had to be composed "to conciliate varying Catholic groups, supporting here, in part of the text, one group, there, in another part, an opposed group."²³ At the time, the most alert American observer on the Roman scene reported concerning the preparation of *Rerum novarum* that "the Pope is trying to embody in it everybody's views."²⁴ It would seem that influences of Georgism should be sought in the perspectives developed in the national contexts and in the ways in which these perspectives were reflected in the theoretical and practical questions put to Roman authorities.

A second related but broader channel of possible influence was through the forums in which Georgism was discussed as a type of socialism. The threat of socialism provided a general context within which the new workingmen's associations were being considered by many, including many Catholic bishops. The international socialist movement could not be ignored and had to be an object of papal policy.²⁵ The Roman curia was obviously attentive to it and to Henry George as well during the 1880s when the condemnation of the Knights of Labor in the United States was being considered. In communicating to the American hierarchy the decision of the Holy Office against the proposed condemnation of the Knights, the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith wrote to the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore with reference to the organization that "especially in the preamble of the constitution for local assemblies words which seem to savor of socialism and communism must be emended in such a way as to make

clear that the soil was granted by God to man, or rather the human race, that each one might have the right to acquire some portion of it, by use however of lawful means and without violation of the right of private property."²⁶ Preoccupation with socialism remained characteristic of Catholic attitudes toward the labor movement until well into the 20th century.²⁷

American ecclesiastical developments of the 1880s that have been mentioned above illustrate the point. Georgism was brought to Rome's attention directly in the series of events that resulted in the excommunication of McGlynn and the review of George's works. These actions were preceded by lengthy investigations and debates. For example, in summarizing the McGlynn case for his colleagues in the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Cardinal Camillo Mazzella, S.J., who had lived and taught in the United States, began with the remark that the case "agitates an intricate and difficult social question."²⁸ The Congregation was concerned to maintain a distinction between the issues posed by McGlynn's disobedience to ecclesiastical authority and questions of doctrinal error.²⁹ As already noted, the eventual finding with respect to George's writings was preceded by numerous pleas against formal action that began with a memorial of Cardinal Gibbons to Cardinal Simeoni on February 25, 1887. These pleas had only a deferring effect.³⁰ George's works were found by the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition to be "worthy of condemnation" on February 6, 1889, with the proviso, already mentioned, that the judgment should be communicated only to the bishops and should not be published.

It is difficult to estimate to what extent the Holy See may have been moved by the direct suggestions from American bishops that the moral questions presented by changing social conditions should be clarified by the pope. Leo XIII had already issued numerous encyclicals and letters to national hierarchies on a variety of subjects.³¹ All the while, it seems, Archbishop Corrigan was "looking anxiously for the Encyclical on Socialism."³²

Catholics, it should be noted, were by no means alone in appraising George's position in this context. No less noted an economist than the youthful Richard T. Ely linked Georgism with revolutionary socialism.³³ Barker notes, correctly of course, that George's assistance to socialism was only indirect and that "he fought socialists and their doctrines."³⁴ George wrote to his son that the intent of his *Open Letter to Pope Leo XIII* was "to make a clear, brief explanation of our principles; to show their religious character, and to draw a line between us and the Socialists."³⁵ Ironically, George himself found in *Rerum novarum* that "the whole tendency and spirit of its remedial

suggestions lean unmistakably to socialism—extremely moderate socialism it is true; socialism hampered and emasculated by a supreme respect for private possessions; yet socialism still.”³⁶

III

THE PRECISE DISPOSITION of Henry George's *Open Letter* after its receipt at the Vatican remains obscure. According to Barker, the work was sent in proof by George to the Pope during September 1891. The archives for this period—and the entire Leonine papacy—have been open only since 1978, and the present author has found George's galley proofs preserved with other voluminous deposits of correspondence and publications relating to *Rerum novarum*.³⁷ There appears to be no accompanying letter of presentation, however, nor could any record of the receipt of such a letter or of the galley proofs be found in the scrupulously maintained indexes of the Secretariat of State. Barker reports also that a copy of the American edition was sent.³⁸ He and other authors cite the report of Henry George, Jr. that “a copy of the translation of the ‘Letter to the Pope,’ beautifully printed and handsomely bound, was presented to Leo XIII personally by Monsignor Caprini, Prefect of the Vatican Library, though Mr. George never received, directly or indirectly, aught in reply.”³⁹ Neither the American edition nor the specially bound Italian edition nor reference to them have been found. It is possible but by no means certain that they were sent to the Holy Office, in view of its earlier finding concerning George's work, although the usual procedures followed would have recorded the referral. But a paper-bound copy of the Italian edition, its pages still uncut, is in the Vatican Archives.⁴⁰ The Vatican Library has two paper-bound copies of this edition, one in its general collection, the other in its Ferraioli Collection, received from a donor, but no copy in a special binding.

An explanation of the failure of the Holy See to acknowledge George's *Open Letter* does not suggest itself. Barker, without speculating as to the reasons, remarks that, “realizing that he could expect no reply from the pope himself or from a spokesman, George had hoped simply to put pressure on all socially minded Christians.”⁴¹ George himself wrote to his son that his real intention was to reach “such men as Cardinal Manning, General Booth and religious-minded men of all creeds.”⁴² Some authors have connected events too easily in reporting that “the Church did modify its opposition to the single tax, and it was believed that George was influential in promoting this change in attitude.”⁴³ Barker goes so far as to cite as “the only plausible

assumption" his impression that "recent Catholic scholarship assumes that George's book did have an effect within the Church and did help restore McGlynn."⁴⁴ This was of course George's own belief. Writing to Father Dawson in London, on December 23, 1892, he credited Leo XIII with being "a very great man" and added, "Whether he ever read my 'Open Letter' I cannot tell, but he has been acting as though he had not only read it, but had recognized its force."⁴⁵

The conclusion of George and others that the reinstatement of McGlynn was a sign of the effect of the *Open Letter* must be questioned in view of the sequence of events in the case. This was acknowledged long ago by Geiger, who attributed the reconciliation of McGlynn to "general church policy" that had for its aim the healing of "a decided schism in the ranks of New York and even of American Catholicism."⁴⁶ Such a concern of the Holy See was certainly a factor from the outset. But more particular questions were also presented. In so far as the compatibility of George's theories with Catholic doctrine was involved, McGlynn had entered a public challenge to the interpretation given in Corrigan's pastoral letter of November, 1886.⁴⁷ His canonical adviser throughout his ordeal insisted that he was in the area of "free doctrine."⁴⁸ Similarly, after reading the pastoral letter, the Archbishop of Dublin, William J. Walsh, wrote to Cardinal Manning his opinion that if Corrigan had actually read *Progress and Poverty* he could not have "failed to see the irrelevancy of the arguments" on which he had relied in attributing to George "the doctrine denying the right of property, as if George held that no ownership (in anything) could exist."⁴⁹ As mentioned above, when the officials of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (which then had charge of American affairs) met to consider the McGlynn case, they recognized at the outset the need to distinguish between its doctrinal and disciplinary aspects. The Roman congregations were aware that Corrigan's repeated requests for the condemnation of George had little support in the American hierarchy. (The opposition was pragmatic, based upon the expectation that George's theories would soon be forgotten by the American public.) Cardinal Manning, at least, as a member of the congregation charged with passing on the matter, was similarly opposed.⁵⁰ There was a sign of a somewhat benevolent attitude toward McGlynn as early as February 16, 1887 when Pope Leo raised the question of McGlynn's status with Cardinal Gibbons, making clear that his case had not been judged and asking Gibbons to urge McGlynn to come to Rome.⁵¹ Two and a half years later, in 1889—after the adverse judgment of George's works—Archbishop Francesco Satolli, as papal ablegate for special missions in the United States, sought to secure an interview with

McGlynn. This was almost two years before *Rerum novarum* and the *Open Letter*.⁵²

What is of most interest from the point of view of Catholic social teaching is the dual need illustrated in the controversies associated with Georgism to distinguish carefully between the spheres proper to revealed religion and those proper to human judgment and at the same time to allow for the possibility of development of the social teaching. With respect to the former, Bishop John J. Keane, when he was still Bishop of Richmond but also rector-designate of the newly-founded Catholic University of America, wrote to Cardinal Manning that he and Bishop John Ireland of St. Paul, who were in Rome on university business, were urging curial officials "to treat the McGlynn case on its *individual* merits, but not to open up a discussion of social theories."⁵³ Even more explicitly, Pope Leo himself, while *Rerum novarum* was in preparation, was said to have withheld approbation of a specific proposal made by the highly esteemed Comte de Mun with the remark, "If I gave my approval to particular points on matters essentially economic, I would be restricting the liberty of men in an area where God left them entirely to themselves."⁵⁴ The same distinction was exemplified when Archbishop Satolli, whose appointment as the first apostolic delegate to the United States was soon to be announced, undertook to submit to four professors of the new university's first faculty McGlynn's own statement of his principles, with the result that they found it to contain "nothing contrary to Catholic belief."⁵⁵ Soon one of the four who was later to be a bishop could report from Rome a conversation in which a curial official reportedly told him, with respect to George's proposal, "there is no right or wrong implied in the question. If you people in the U.S. want [a] single tax, why take it; it is nobody's business but your own."⁵⁶

Archbishop Corrigan, however, remained relentless in seeking from Rome explanations of how the theories of George could be reconciled with Catholic teaching, and apparently wanted further condemnations.⁵⁷ Hearing rumors of this possibility, Archbishop Ireland, at least, wrote at length to the Papal Secretary of State to forestall any such action, warning that it "would lead to deplorable recriminations" and was in any case unnecessary in view of the encyclical teaching.⁵⁸

In time, as Catholic social teaching developed, it came to be seen that Leo XIII, who had instituted officially a vigorous Thomist revival, nevertheless may have held what one scholar has called an "un-Thomist understanding of private property as an almost metaphysical right."⁵⁹ Incorporating interpretations of later popes, the bishops in Vatican Council II extended the principle that

Leo XIII had emphasized in the political order in decreeing that the Church "in virtue of her mission and nature, is bound to no particular form of human culture, nor to any political, economic, or social system."⁶⁰ The course of this development and its implications for Georgism cannot be examined within the scope of this paper. The verdict of the university professors in 1892 was sustained more than four decades later when a student, reviewing McGlynn's statement to the apostolic delegate, concluded that although "economically his proposals might be censured; theologically, they do not contain any false principles."⁶¹ Another student, applying philosophical analysis to the theories of George himself, arrived at the judgment that although "the single tax system might fail to meet the requirements of commutative justice, the ideal it proposed, that of securing a more equitable distribution of material goods, may still serve as a challenge for those who would promote the best interests of society."⁶² It is interesting, as a student of American Catholic responses has observed, that "many Catholic ideas and solutions for the labor problem began as rebuttals to Georgism."⁶³

Notes

1. *The Condition of Labor. An Open Letter to Pope Leo XIII* (New York: United States Book Co, 1891), p. 3. An English translation of the encyclical is included in an appendix; the official Latin text is to be found in *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, Vol. 23 (1891), pp. 641–70.

2. Charles Albro Barker, *Henry George* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1955), p. 573.

3. *Open Letter*, pp. 114–15.

4. Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore (hereafter AAB), Gibbons Papers, 85-W-4, Cardinal Giovanni Simeoni, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, to Cardinal James Gibbons, Rome, April 9, 1889, in Latin, communicating under obligation of secrecy the finding of the Sacred Congregation of the General and Universal Inquisition (later the Holy Office) and its decision to refrain from a public condemnation which would have placed George's works formally on the Index of Forbidden Books, but to enjoin the American bishops to pastoral vigilance. The grounds of the finding are stated as George's "false theories" of private property in opposition to Catholic teaching as outlined in the encyclical letters *Qui pluribus*, of Pope Pius IX, and *Quod Apostolici muneris*, of Pope Leo XIII, dealing with socialism. For an account of the ecclesiastical events based upon the Roman archival sources (except those of the Holy Office, which are closed), see Gerald P. Fogarty, S.J., *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965* ("Päpste und Papstum," Vol. 21 (Stuttgart: Anton Hierseman, 1982), Chap. 4. See also, John Tracy Ellis, *The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, 1834–1921* (2 vols.; Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1952), Vol. 1, Chap. 13. Fogarty overstates technically in reporting that "George's works were placed on the Index" (p. 103). It must be noted, however, that, even without formal listing of their condemnation, Catholics could regard them as included under prohibited categories. Barker, *op. cit.*, pp. 489–90, correctly assesses the effect of the decree in this respect. Currently, although the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has succeeded to the work of the Holy Office in passing judgment on theological works brought

to its attention, the practice of publishing a list of condemned works appears to have been discontinued.

5. Henry George, Jr., *The Life of Henry George*, Memorial Edition of the Writings of Henry George, Vol. 10 (New York: Doubleday & McClure Co., 1900), pp. 565–66.

6. Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 573. The son, however, reported also that Manning had "intimated that between the postulates and the deduction [in the encyclical] Henry George could drive a coach and four." *Life*, p. 565.

7. James L. Busey, in Robert V. Andelson, ed, *Critics of Henry George; A Centenary Appraisal of Their Strictures on "Progress and Poverty"* (Teaneck, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson Univ. Press, 1979), p. 337.

8. Jacob Oser, *Henry George* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1974), p. 97. Henry George, Jr. noted that "while there was a confusion of socialism and anarchism with the single tax, and neither Henry George nor the single tax proposition were specifically named, yet Archbishop Corrigan of New York hailed the papal letter as the highest sanction of his own opposition to the single tax doctrine as preached by Dr. McGlynn and Henry George." *Life*, p. 565.

9. Adolf Damaschke, "Henry George," *Berichte des Freier Deutschen Hochstifts zu Frankfurt am Main*, Vol. 15, p. 190, quoted by Michael Silagi, *Henry George und Europa: Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der europäischen Bodenreformbewegungen* (München: Etana, 1973), pp. 149–50.

10. George Raymond Geiger, *The Philosophy of Henry George* (Grand Forks, N.D.: published by the author, 1931), p. 302; (New York: Macmillan Co., 1933, p. 362).

11. *Op. cit.*, p. 573.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 572–73.

13. For summaries and bibliographies, see Joseph N. Moody *et al.*, "Social Movements, Catholic," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1967), Vol. 12, pp. 321–35.

14. Georges Jarlot, S.J., *Doctrines pontificale et histoire l'enseignement social de Léon XIII, Pié X et Benoît XV vu dans son ambiance historique (1878–1922)* (Rome: Presses de l'Université Gregorienne, 1964), p. 177.

15. Silagi, *op. cit.*, pp. 147–48.

16. Gerald P. Fogarty, S.J., *The Vatican and the Americanist Crisis: Denis J. O'Connell, American Agent in Rome, 1885–1903* (Rome: Universita Gregoriana Editrice, 1974), pp. 174–75, enumerates the sources of requests for an encyclical on social questions presented in the course of attempts to prevent the condemnation of George's works. See also, Ellis, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp. 578, 581–82.

17. Eduardo Soderini, *The Pontificate of Leo XIII*, trans. Barbara Barclay Carter (London: Burns, Oates & Washburne, 1934), Vol. 1, p. 67.

18. Henry J. Browne, *The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949), p. 347.

19. Giovanni Antonazzi, ed., *L'Enciclica "Rerum Novarum" Testo Autentico e Redazioni Preparatorie dai Documenti Originali* (Rome: Edizione di Storia e Letteratura, 1957), p. 93n. For a summary and comment, see Joseph N. Moody, "Leo XIII and the Social Crisis," in Edward T. Gargan, ed., *Leo XIII and the Modern World* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961), pp. 75–79.

20. Official English translation.

21. See the account below. The decree of the Congregation led Bishop Bernard McQuaid of Rochester, a former teacher and devoted friend of Archbishop Corrigan, to remark to Denis O'Connell, the rector of the North American College in Rome, "What's the use of it, if you can't publish it?" AAB, Gibbons Papers, 86-C-12, O'Connell to Gibbons, Rome, June 14, 1889, *Private*.

22. Cf. Silagi, *op. cit.* Barker, *op. cit.*, Chaps. 12–13, recounts George's activities in Ireland, England, and Scotland. Catholic bishops in Ireland and in the United States supported the Irish Land League until the issuance of the "No Rent Manifesto" in 1881. James Jeremiah Green, *The Impact of Henry George's Theories on American Catholics* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1956), assesses American Catholic interest in Georgism as a "transmutation of the Irish question into an American labor question" (p. vii).

23. John Coleman, S.J., "What Is An Encyclical?" *Origins, NC Documentary Service*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (June 4, 1981), p. 39.

24. Archives of the Catholic University of America (hereafter ACUA), Keane Papers, O'Connell to John J. Keane, Rome, March 20, 1891. (Keane was rector of the Catholic University of America.)

25. See Lillian Parker Wallace, *Leo XIII and the Rise of Socialism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1966).

26. AAB, Gibbons Papers, 84-Y-3, Simeoni to Gibbons, Rome, Aug. 29, 1888. Soderini, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 176, attributes the concerns expressed to information about Georgism in the United States.

27. Aaron I. Abell, "The Reception of Leo XIII's Labor Encyclical in America, 1891–1919," *Review of Politics*, Vol. 7, No. 4 (October, 1945), pp. 464–95.

28. Archives of the Sacred Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples or "Propaganda Fide" (hereafter APF), *Acta*, 1888, rubric 258, folio 2, in Italian.

29. APF, *Lettere e Decreti*, 1888, Vol. 384, folio 78–79, Simeoni to Corrigan, Rome, Feb. 18, 1888, in Italian.

30. The memorial is reprinted in John Tracy Ellis, ed., *Documents of American Catholic History* (Milwaukee; Bruce Publishing Co., 1956), pp. 473–76. On Gibbons' efforts, see Ellis, *Gibbons*, Vol. 1, pp. 574–85. The responses of other American bishops to Gibbons are in the Archives of the Diocese of Richmond (hereafter ADR), O'Connell Papers (O'Connell acted as Gibbons' agent in Rome), and are summarized in Browne, *op. cit.*, pp. 317–22.

31. Jarlot, *op. cit.*

32. ACUA, Microfilm Collection, Abbot Bernard Smith, O.S.B. Papers, Flashes, Corrigan to Smith, New York, April 2, 1891.

33. "Recent American Socialism," *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, Third Series, Vol. 4 (1885), pp. 16–27.

34. *Op. cit.*, p. x.

35. *Life*, p. 567.

36. *Open Letter*, p. 79.

37. Secret Archives of the Vatican (hereafter ASV), Secretariat of State, 1891, rubric 1, fascicle 14, folios 7–38.

38. *Op. cit.*, pp. 574–75.

39. *Life*, p. 567.

40. ASV, Secretariat of State, 1891, rubric 1, fascicle 14, folio 6. The Italian edition, *La condizione dei lavoratori; lettera aperta a S. S. Leone XIII di Enrico George*, trans. Ludovico

Eusebio (Turin: Unione tipografico-editrice, 1891), had been entrusted to the translator and publisher who had earlier produced the Italian edition of *Progress and Poverty*.

41. *Op. cit.*, p. 575.
42. *Life*, p. 567.
43. Oser, *op. cit.*, p. 102.
44. *Op. cit.*, p. 577.
45. Quoted in *Life*, p. 560n.
46. *Op. cit.*, p. 309.
47. New York *Tribune*, Jan. 23, 1887.
48. *Life*, p. 565n.
49. Quoted in Patrick J. Walsh, *William J. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin* (Dublin: Talbot Press, 1928), p. 230. The letter was written from Dublin, Jan. 7, 1887.
50. McGlynn had quoted Manning to his advantage in responding to Corrigan's pastoral letter, as Corrigan reported to Manning "presuming" that George had "misunderstood" what Manning had said. ACUA, Microfilm Collections, Corrigan to Manning, New York, Nov. 30, 1886. Corresponding with Manning's biographer from Gibbons' residence, Denis J. O'Connell wrote to explain Gibbons' letter to Manning of March 23, 1888 opposing condemnation "because he was of the opinion that whatever errors lay in the theories of Mr. George they would be certainly brought out and corrected by the freedom of American debate without the need of a condemnation." *Ibid.*, O'Connell to Shane Leslie, Baltimore, Aug. 6, 1913.
51. Archives of the Archdiocese of New York, Gibbons to Corrigan, Rome, Feb. 18, 1887, *Personal*, quoted by Ellis, *Gibbons*, Vol. 1, p. 554.
52. Geiger, *op. cit.*, pp. 296, 309.
53. ACUA, Microfilm Collections, Keane to Manning, Rome, Feb. 10, 1887.
54. Soderini, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 67.
55. APF, N.S. Vol. 194 (1900), rubric 153, folios 53-70, Hector Papi to Cardinal Mieciuslaw Ledochowski, Washington, D.C., June 14, 1893. McGlynn's statement has been reprinted in several works, including Sylvester L. Malone, *Dr. Edward McGlynn* (New York: Dr. McGlynn Monument Association, 1918 and, reprinted, Arno Press, 1978), pp. 47-51.
56. ADR, O'Connell Papers, Thomas O'Gorman to O'Connell, n.p., n.d.
57. New York *Tribune*, Feb. 24, 1894, carried a report to this effect.
58. ASV, 1891, rubric 1, fascicle 12, folios 80-83, Ireland to Cardinal Mariano Rampolla, St. Paul, Jan. 11, 1894.
59. Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
60. *Gaudium et spes*, Par. 42, translation in Walter M. Abbott, S.J. (ed.), *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Herder & Herder and Association Press, 1966), p. 242.
61. Vincent A. McQuade, O.S.A., "Rev. Dr. McGlynn's Statement on Private Land Ownership in the Light of the Teaching of Pope Leo XIII" (unpublished master's dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1935), p. 45.
62. Sister Miriam Ann Cunningham, C.S.C., "A Thomistic Appraisal of the Philosophy of Henry George" (unpublished master's dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1950), pp. 62-63.
63. Green, *op. cit.*, p. 188.