

III. THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

ON SATURDAY evening, March 26, three days before the “Cross of a New Crusade” speech, at the office of the *Standard*, the Anti-Poverty Society was born. It was organized in skeleton form by a group of men of diverse religious views, but all, Catholics, Protestants, agnostics, were bound together by a common belief in the rights of man; the right to earn an honest living, and to the means by which this right could be attained and maintained. Dr. McGlynn was named as its president.

Its first public meeting, however, was not held until May 1, in Chickering Hall. Meanwhile the fame of the Doctor was spreading. On April 28 he had repeated in the Brooklyn Academy of Music to a crowded house his “Cross of a New Crusade” address, and calls were coming from other cities for its repetition. Ah! the radio has ended forever those halcyon days when an orator could repeat indefinitely his triumphs with a speech that had captured the heart of his public.

At this first meeting of the Anti-Poverty Society, Chickering Hall was so packed that its owners refused to rent it to the Society for future meetings, declaring it was unsafe. Here for the second time the Doctor attempted to open his address by a recital of the Lord’s Prayer, but could not finish it, the audience springing to its feet in a rapture of applause as the words “Thy

89 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

will be done *on earth* as it is in heaven” were intoned with meaning emphasis. Though Scribes and Pharisees might rage, the common people heard him gladly.

It was in this speech that the Doctor “slopped over” with an anti-climax—well intended, but an anti-climax nevertheless—for in the midst of a magnificent address on the realities and essentials of true religion he drew his celebrated picture of “the Pope in a plug hat.” Contrasting the simplicity of St. Peter and the early heads of the Church with the pomp and splendor of the present, he exclaimed:

Religion will never be right until we see a democratic pope walking down Broadway in a stovepipe hat, wearing a frock-coat and trousers, and with an umbrella under his arm. In my opinion, that will be the greatest of all popes, for instead of being carried on men’s shoulders he will carry them all in his heart and they will carry him in theirs.

The papers went gleefully for this as a juicy tidbit for sprightly comment and it did much to divert public attention from a really great address. His peroration follows:

Let us do what we can to right this wrong and to cause the blessed day of justice to dawn. And the dawn of that day of justice will be the beginning of the doing on earth of the will of the Father as it is done in heaven. It will be the beginning of the reign of the Prince of Peace.

Hardly had the last note of the anthem sung by the old choir of St. Stephen’s died away than a great part of the audience began a scramble to reach the platform, and

for a half hour the officers were kept busy receiving

90 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

ing the money and applications for membership thrust upon them. The doctor had withdrawn to an anteroom to wait for the crowd to disperse that he might depart quietly, but multitudes of his old parishioners refused to disperse and sought him out, just to grasp his hand, look into his face and give him a fervent "God bless you, Dr. McGlynn!"

Henry George said of this meeting: "It means the marriage again of what too long have been severed—the union of the religious sentiment with the aspiration for social reform; of the hope of heaven with the hope of banishing want and suffering from the earth."

But the New York *Tribune* said of it:

There would be something almost comic in the idea of an Anti-Poverty Society such as Henry George and Dr. McGlynn are trying to establish, were it not apparent that the name has been chosen simply to popularize the fantastic and inimical land doctrine which the projectors hold.

Dr. McGlynn, commenting on this bit of editorial wisdom, quoted the Nazarene's remark about things "hidden from the wise and prudent and revealed unto babes."

On April 8 the New York *Tribune* published a report that Fr. Lynch of the Church of the Transfiguration was circulating among the Catholic clergy of the diocese a petition, or rather an endorsement of Archbishop Corrigan's administration and a condemnation of the course taken by Dr. McGlynn and his friends, which was to be forwarded to Rome to counteract the growing impression that a majority of them favored the priest in his controversy with the Archbishop. Fr. Lynch had

91 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

been an assistant to Vicar-General Preston, one of Dr. McGlynn's most ardent opponents. Eleven days later the *Tribune* told of the failure of this effort to get the priests to sign a condemnation of Dr. McGlynn and the parishioners of St. Stephen's. It was stated that a modified document had been written in the form of an address to the Archbishop, in which the Doctor and the St. Stephen's parishioners were not mentioned, and which was little more than a general expression of sympathy with and approval of the Archbishop and his policy. Many priests refused to sign even this, Dr. Curran being conspicuous among them. One of them was quoted by the *Tribune* as saying: "The friends of Dr. McGlynn are volunteers in his behalf and I cannot see what Archbishop Corrigan, with all his rich friends at his back, needs sympathy for." Another pointedly remarked: "When coercion has to be used to secure sympathy, a cause is lost."

Dr. Curran not only refused to sign it, but wrote a letter for the press quoting the address and giving his reasons for refusing to sign it. The address to the Archbishop in the final form for which signatures were solicited and as published by the

newspapers was as follows:

MOST REVEREND ARCHBISHOP:

We, the priests of the archdiocese of New York, come before you to express our sincere attachment to you and our unfeigned and cheerful loyalty to your authority.

We recognize in you our ecclesiastical superior, who, being in full communion with the head of the Catholic Church, the successor of St. Peter, lawfully rule, teach and

92 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

judge this portion of the flock of Christ, the archdiocese of New York.

Conformably to the exhortation of St. Paul, we look up to you as our “prelate who speaks to us the word of God, whose faith we follow.” And, pondering the grave injunction of the same apostle: “Obey your prelates and be subject to them, for they watch as being to render an account of your souls, that they may do this with joy, and not with grief; for this is not expedient for you.”¹ We desire also on this occasion to record our entire disapproval and reprobation of the act of disobedience and disloyalty to your authority of which a certain member of our body has made himself guilty, an act of disloyalty aggravated by his subsequent course.

We have been patiently hoping and praying that our dear brother would change his mind and return to his Father’s house. But, observing that our charitable silence is construed into acquiescence in, and approval of, disobedience, and that **it** causes some surprise both here and abroad; learning, moreover, that it is publicly asserted that he is believed to be upheld in his course by the clergy in general; we feel **it** our duty to make this solemn declaration to you, *that the clergy of the archdiocese of New York utterly condemn all disobedience to lawfully constituted authority, especially to the authority of the Church, and can have no sympathy with the efforts of those who in any way set that authority aside.*² Our motto shall be always: “An obedient man shall speak of victory.”

Dr. Curran’s letter was in part as follows:

You speak of a “certain member of our body” as disobedient and disloyal. I know of none such. The priest to

¹ Heb. xiii, 17.

² Italics mine.

³ Rev. xxi, 28.

93 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

whom I am told you refer in your address has declared again and again that if the doctrine, for refusing to abandon which he is still suspended from his pastoral office, should be condemned by the only authority we all recognize in such matters, he would, as a Catholic, repudiate it. And I know with certainty that that authority, so far from condemning, has never even examined it.

Moreover, I should feel guilty of a pharisaical hypocrisy if, after seeming by my signature to approve that part of your address which I have said I could not sign

without feeling guilty of calumny, I should join with you in saying, "We have been patiently hoping and praying that our dear brother would change his mind and return to his Father's house." I should be conscious that I was guilty of calumniating him by implying that he had ever abandoned his Father's house. The calumny would be all the more unpardonable since the "dear brother" has several times publicly asseverated with the greatest emphasis and solemnity that he never has and never will abandon what you must mean by "his Father's house," the holy Catholic Church .

Much as I should like to see Dr. McGlynn restored to his ministry, I could not be so cruel as to wish it on a condition that would make him unworthy of **it**, the sinning against his conscience and therefore against the Holy Ghost, by condemning a doctrine he believes to be true and of the greatest importance, not only to the material but to the moral and spiritual welfare of the masses of God's children, and which I and many others of his brethren, in common with many eminent Cardinals, Archbishops and other prelates of the Church, believe he is entirely free to hold.

Besides withholding my signature from this address, I would in the most fraternal spirit give a word of advice in that you should reconsider your apparently hasty and illadvised action and withdraw the document, which is not

94 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

only uncalled for, but which, if presented, will stand a perpetual stigma upon the clergy of this diocese

I have excellent reason to believe that the majority of those who have been or may be induced to sign this address will have done so with the greatest reluctance and regret . . . JAMES T. CURRAN.

But pressure from an Archbishop or his friends to sign a paper was a serious thing to resist, and a majority of the priests were finally induced to sign it. For some occult reason, Bishop McQuaid took no public notice of Dr. Curran's letter.

On April 12 Dr. McGlynn delivered an address before an audience that filled the Music Hall in Cincinnati, Ohio, in the course of which he gave the following simple and rather witty exposition of the "Single Tax":

We have no quarrel with the payment of rent, but we have an eternal war with its payment to the wrong men. The rental value of land is the very shadow of society that follows society as the shadow follows the man who walks hither and thither.

Our object is to have laws enacted by which the rental values of land shall be taken by the community because they are created by the community and rightfully belong to **it**, and to abolish all taxation on the products of labor. Thus alone can justice be secure. It would give to every man all that he can honestly acquire, and leave to no man what he does not deserve to have.⁴

The Cincinnati papers gave accurate reports of the address and even made favorable comments on it, agreeing that the Doctor had raised the land theories of Henry George to a level demanding sane discussion of

⁴ The *Standard*.

95 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

their merits. The presence of a number of Catholic priests in the audience was noted.

“GAGGING THE PRESS”

On April 23, 1887,. the *Standard* exploded a veritable bombshell with the publication of the following letter under the caption “Gagging the Press”:

452 Madison Avenue,
New York, April 13, 1887

To THE EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR OF *THE CATHOLIC*

HERALD:

GENTLEMEN: By this note, which is entirely *private* and *not to be published*, I wish to call your attention to the fact that the third plenary council of Baltimore, following the leadership of Pope Leo XIII, has pointed out the duties of the Catholic press, and denounced the abuses of which journals styling themselves Catholic are sometimes guilty. “That paper alone,” says the council (decree No. 228), “is to be regarded as Catholic that is prepared to submit in all things to ecclesiastical authority.” Later on it warns all Catholic writers against presuming to attack publicly the manner in which a bishop rules his diocese, affirming that those who so presume, as well as their approvers and abettors, are not only guilty of very grievous scandals, but deserve, moreover, to be dealt with by canonical censures.

For some time past the editors of *The Catholic Herald* have been shockingly scandalous. As this newspaper is published in this diocese, I hereby warn you that if you continue in this course of conduct **it** will be at your peril. I am, gentlemen, yours truly, M. A. **CORRIGAN**,

Archbishop of New York.

96 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

No one was more surprised at its publication than the gentleman to whom it was addressed, Mr. D. O’Loughlin, owner and managing editor. Had he intended it to be published it would have appeared in his own paper. How the *Standard* obtained it he did not know, but he surmised correctly that one of his friends to whom he had shown it had thought it should be published and had obtained a copy of it. It had seemed like an attempt to crush him without letting the fact become public. Had the Archbishop set out to furnish the “Know-Nothings” with irrefutable proofs of the truth of their assertions that the Church of Rome was an influence opposed to the American spirit of liberty, he could have given them nothing stronger than this letter. The Archbishop alone was responsible for it. Bishop McQuaid apparently did not advise it. It was widely copied and adversely commented on, and there can be no doubt that it created many enemies of the Church among those

who were beginning to have toleration or friendship for it. Fortunately, its power for mischief in this regard was weakened considerably by its very stupidity.

Not so in the Church itself, however, for it deepened and widened the rift. Mr. O'Loughlin, though plainly worried by the possible consequences, denied the authority of the Church to control his columns, saying he was publishing a newspaper presenting news and events of interest to Catholics, not an organ of the Church, and held himself free to criticize even the highest ecclesiastic in the world, but this did not save him from ecclesiastical wrath. A Canadian prelate, Bishop Peter McIntyre of Charlottetown, addressed to

97 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

the churches of his jurisdiction a letter condemning Mr. O'Loughlin and his paper for trying thus to circumscribe the authority of the Church and advised his people to "abandon this publication, the influence of which cannot but be pernicious." So far as is known, Archbishop Corrigan never sent out any formal letter of the kind, but his desires were well understood. In spite of the good wishes and patronage of the McGlynn element of the Church, the circulation and advertising of the *Herald* suffered, and eventually Mr. O'Loughlin was compelled to suspend publication, which he did rather than submit to the Archbishop. This incident drove thousands from the Church.

And now Father Sylvester Malone of SS. Peter and Paul Church, Brooklyn, again took a hand in the quarrel, giving to the New York *Herald* a synopsis of the letter he had written to the Pope on December 29, 1886, protesting the Archbishop's course. It was an able paper, the salient point of which was that the charges against Dr. McGlynn, as understood by the American people, raised the question of the right of a citizen to utter freely and openly his views on American political questions that were non-essential to religious faith, and that, as nothing could alter this view of the case, it was unwise to give American citizens even a suspicion that the Church was an enemy of the principles of liberty held sacred by the Americans. He strongly urged the Holy Father to "see the importance of this fact, for fact it is, as all the press, both Democratic and Republican, d

well on this point—that civil liberty is trodden under foot in the person of Dr. Mc-

98 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

Glynn should Rome sanction his removal from the pastoral charge of St. Stephen's twenty thousand souls."

If it was political power for the Church of Rome at which Archbishop Corrigan was aiming, and it is difficult to understand his course on any other theory, for he was of that element which desired above all things the recovery of at least a moiety of the temporal power it had lost in the European revolutions and counter-revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, he was pursuing a most ill-advised method. He not only found in Dr. McGlynn and his supporters an indomitable force within the Church which insisted on the complete political independence of the clergy and laity, but he aroused dormant opposition and even hatred for the Church in Protestant circles which ordinarily care little for denominational labels. He had started and was continuing a controversy in which

victory for him meant defeat for his Church.

On Wednesday, May 4, Dr. McGlynn filled the Philadelphia Academy of Music almost to suffocation, and the newspapers gave very fair accounts of his speech, albeit some of them did it with wry faces. It was evident that the priest who was expected to sink into obscurity after his suspension was looming to the proportions of a national leader. *The Catholic Herald*, by this time emphatically under the Archbishop's displeasure, said:

Dr. McGlynn has lost a parish and gained a continent. He will regain the parish and retain the continent.

Which only goes to show that as prophets Messrs. O'Loughlin and Gahan were very good editors.

99 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

THE O'BRIEN INCIDENT

In May, **1887**, there occurred an incident or series of incidents which afforded Dr. McGlynn further occasion to exhibit the breadth and universality of his sympathies and to show the futility of following expediency rather than principle in urging desirable reforms. There came to this country William O'Brien, Irish member of the British Parliament, representing the Parnell wing of Home Rulers, to lecture and endeavor to raise money for the carrying on of the agitation for Irish Home Rule. He had previously lectured in several Canadian cities, where he had met with considerable disorderly opposition and had even run afoul of the authorities. The disorders were created chiefly by Irish Protestants or "Orangemen," who insisted on regarding Home Rule as a mere euphemism for "Rome Rule." They had broken up his meetings, and at least one attempt to assassinate him had been made.

Why this antipathy between Protestants and Catholics in Ireland should persist so long and to a degree unparalleled in other lands defies reasonable analysis. Those who quarrel over religion show a singular lack of true religious sentiment. The real quarrel was economic and political, with which sectarian "religion" has nothing to do. But Ireland has been a conquered country, has never forgotten it, and has long associated the oppressions of a vicious economic system with the conquerors. Rack-renting is rack-renting, however, whether landlords be English, Scotch or Irish—and Irish landlords, good and bad, have been and are of all three nations.

100 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

Mr. O'Brien came to New York denouncing the Governor-General of Canada, who, representing the British Crown, had done nothing to make his path easier, and also another member of the British Parliament, Lord Lansdowne, as one of Ireland's most oppressive landlords. He found here some of the same opposition he had found in Canada. He found, too, large numbers of enthusiastic Land Leaguers who had imbibed from Dr. McGlynn their understanding of what Ireland really

needed. But he was feted and lionized by politicians seeking to make themselves “solid with the Irish,” who advised him to keep clear of entanglement with the George-McGlynn crowd. The Single-Taxers were sincerely and devotedly friendly to his cause, seeking only to show him how he could better direct his energies by broadening their scope, but he chose to take the advice of his political and professional Irish friends who rejected the Georgean method of dealing with the Irish grievance, and who also warned him against discussing or endorsing issues that might look like “interference in American politics.”

Dr. McGlynn labored valiantly to save him from his professional Irish friends, but he was wise only in his own conceit and chose not to be saved. His crowning offense in New York was his refusal to appear at a meeting in his honor by the Central Labor Union because the resolutions framed for urging land reform were too broad in their scope and because John McMackin, a close friend of George and McGlynn, was to preside, and the union officials declined to recast the resolutions or change the chairman.

Dr. McGlynn very properly rebuked Mr. O’Brien for

101 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

this attitude, pointing out that he was asking for American sympathy and assistance, even to the point of interfering in British politics, but when asked to admit that the land question had the same significance here that it had in Ireland he drew back lest he be accused of “interfering in American politics.” He was asking for sympathy for the Irish cause while refusing sympathy for the same cause in America.

O’Brien’s mission was a failure, and Ireland was the loser by reason of his failure.

The second meeting of the Anti-Poverty Society was held in the New York Academy of Music on East Fourteenth Street on May 8. The wise ones compared this great theatre with the comparatively small Chickering Hall and, opining that the crowd which jammed the smaller hall had been drawn by curiosity, judged that the audience which could be drawn to the Academy would be so scattered in the large auditorium as to dampen the enthusiasm of the Doctor’s deluded followers. Far to the contrary, the Academy proved quite as inadequate as Chickering Hall had been to hold all who tried to get into it, and this in spite of an admission charge of twenty-five cents to pay the rent of the theatre. At this meeting Henry George was the speaker.

The Doctor spoke that night in Boston, where before an audience that jammed the great Boston Theatre he repeated his “Cross of a New Crusade” oration. There, under the auspices of the United Irish Societies, he added this to his already long list of pithy epigrams:

They read in the fathers that I am wrong, but I read in Christ that I am right.

102 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

In this speech he also took occasion to deny categorically sundry reports of rumors regarding his Intentions *which* were circulating in the press. No, he had no

notion of establishing a new church. Nor was he going to turn Protestant. Nor was he going to preach a crusade against the Pope—he was *for* the Pope. He was going to live and die a Catholic—a Catholic priest—and the only reason he was not preaching in a Catholic pulpit was that certain men in ecclesiastical authority would not let him.

“We don’t want a New Gospel for this country,” he cried, “but we do want the Old Gospel revived. There can be no new religion in the world. True religion must be in its essence as old as man in human history, and as old as God on its objective side. The very essence of all religion is the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.”

The next night he was back in New York, speaking to an audience that filled Cooper Union to its capacity, his subject being “The Sanctity of Labor.” In the course of his talk he dwelt eloquently on the reason why Jesus earned His living at His trade as a carpenter, earning a living being the only honest way of getting it. He said in part:

The Son of Man, the Son of God, came to teach us the blessedness of labor on the one hand, and the exceeding blessedness of justice on the other, to teach us to hunger and thirst after justice, to teach that men must labor, that it is good and healthful for both body and soul to labor, but that it is a crime that cries to heaven to deprive man of the opportunity to labor, or, when he has labored, to deprive him of the just hire of his labor.

103 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

The law of labor is the law of God, but it is a monstrous law if man, who has the means to labor, the desire to labor, is not permitted to labor.

And so that prayer, “Give us this day our daily bread,” will surely never issue from the lips of any true child of God with the meaning and the hope that the Father will feed with bread for which he shall not labor, for that were to ask the Father to put a double burden of labor upon some less fortunate brother, and that were a blasphemy against the Father. Let no man, therefore, dare today, as no man shall dare in that happier day, to say, “Give us this day our daily bread,” and desire anything else by the prayer than abundant justice in the world—abundant opportunity for himself, but no greater than for any one of his brethren, to employ his energies upon the boundless materials that God has spread out for all His children.

It is no ordinary thrill to read in the files of Henry George’s *Standard* of those days full reports of the many fine speeches by Dr. McGlynn, with their breezily vivid presentations of varying phases of the social justice to which he had now dedicated his life. One of the choicest gems was in reference to that oft-quoted text, “The poor ye have always with you.”

“That,” he said, “if I may be permitted to try my hand at interpreting Scripture, is the declaration of a painful fact but not the enunciation of a divine law. And why do they abbreviate the sentence? Why do they not quote it in full? Look it up, and you will read:

‘The poor ye have always with you, *and whenever ye will ye may do them good.*’”

In another of his lectures he said:

104 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

We are not opposed to property. We are of all the people on earth the people who are making the most desperate fight for the right of property. We believe in its sacredness. But land is *not* property. It is an opportunity for the production of property.

There is a distinction between what God through nature has given equally to all His children because He is the equal, impartial and loving Father of them all, and the private property which by God's own law is the proper reward of man's individual industry. We must distinguish between the gifts of nature and the product of human industry.

God never designed that one of His children should exclude any other from the bounties He provided for all. "The earth He hath given to the children of men." It is a goodly habitation in which he has placed His family. And it is a monstrous usurpation of God's property to permit any man to call himself the absolute owner of any portion of it.

Not the property even of the whole human family. God alone is the owner, and He has simply given, as Jefferson tells us, the usufruct of these bounties to each succeeding generation of living men.

Free the earth from the curse of landlordism by taking the entire rental value of land in taxation, leaving to private holders possession of the land they choose to use, and leaving to them also all that they produce by their labor of hand and brain.

On the night following Dr. McGlynn's Boston speech a Jesuit priest, Rev. Francis T. McCarthy, formerly of New York but then of Boston, spoke in opposition at Danbury, Connecticut, saying that any attempt to abolish poverty was wicked and impious. He asserted

105 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

that Christ gave His approval to poverty by doing nothing to relieve it, and that, on the contrary, He blessed and sanctified it.

Well, if that was or is religion, one must not wonder why so many high-minded and noble-hearted men and women here and elsewhere rebel against it. But it is *not* religion. It is a base and lying counterfeit of religion which has inspired the Communists to assert that "religion is the opiate of the human mind."

Despite the doleful prophecies of the wise and prudent editors of the New York newspapers, the meetings of the Anti-Poverty Society continued to jam the Academy till there was not even standing room. The press, which could not ignore these meetings, resorted to reporting them in a way meant to be facetious. Editorially they fell back on the hackneyed theory that the Georgian philosophy was all wrong, its objective impossible of achievement, and its adherents deluded. The Priest and the Prophet were alleged to be successful only in abolishing their own poverty.

However popular this "land for the people" doctrine was becoming among the Catholic laity under the leadership of Dr. McGlynn, and in spite of the fact that Irish bishops and priests were free to approve the doctrine and to a large degree exercised their freedom, with no rebuke from Rome, Archbishop Corrigan and his friends and adherents in this country were indefatigable in their efforts to stem the

tide that was run-ning against them. Since the mayoralty election the preceding year, scores of pamphlets, brochures and magazine articles in opposition to "Georgeism" had

106 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

appeared, many if not most of them being from "authorized" sources hostile to Dr. McGlynn.

May 22, 1887, was a day from which to reckon dates. On that Sunday morning the important newspapers carried on their first page a letter from Pope Leo Xlii to Archbishop Corrigan. It was in Latin. As translated by the New York *Tribune* the first paragraph read as follows:

VENERABLE BROTHER, HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDECTION.

Your letter, dated the 2nd day of April last, has reached me, in which you lament the contumacious disobedience of a priest, one of your subjects, not only toward yourself, but also toward the Apostolic See; and anxiously seek to bring before the supreme tribunal of our authority the false doctrines concerning the right of property, disseminated by him among the people in newspapers and public assemblies.

The letter approved the Archbishop's course and promised "timely measure to correct the rebellious."

So, according to Pope Leo, Dr. McGlynn was a "subject" of His Holiness and Archbishop Corrigan, "contumacious" and "rebellious."

On that same evening there was delivered to Dr. McGlynn by special messenger, as he entered the Academy of Music in Jersey City to speak, a letter from Cardinal Simeoni commanding him, under penalty of excommunication, to appear at Rome within forty days of receipt of the letter. The newspapers published this also.

And on that Sunday evening the Anti-Poverty Society in New York was addressed by the Rev. Hugh Pentecost,

107 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

pastor of the Bellevue Avenue Presbyterian Church, Newark, New Jersey. Mr. Pentecost was compelled later to resign the pastorate of that church because of his taking up this radical-conservative social philosophy. So far as the writer knows, he never got another church. He had the same uncompromising character as had the *Soggarth Aroon*.

At last the Archbishop, his party and the "conservative" press had what they wanted—a letter from supreme authority that "left no room for misunderstanding or cavil." But did the Doctor have it? He refused to discuss it in any way or even admit that he had received it. What had caused the change in the Pope's sentiments toward Dr. McGlynn since March ~, when through a secretary he had sent him a special blessing? We know of nothing except the Archbishop's letter of April 2 to which the Pope alluded, and which, undoubtedly, was inspired or provoked by the Pope's cable of March 3 conveying his blessing to the priest and the St. Stephen's

parishioners.

No copy of this letter by the Archbishop is available for reproduction.

Dr. McGlynn kept his own counsel regarding Cardinal Simeoni's letter. He kept on lecturing before the Anti-Poverty Society and elsewhere. During the last week of May he addressed, besides the Jersey City meeting where the Cardinal's letter was delivered to him, crowded houses in New York, Washington, D. C., and in Hartford, Waterbury, and Meriden, Connecticut. From a report of his Hartford address published by the *Standard* I quote the following:

108 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

I am intensely convinced that poverty is not a law of God, but is a violation of God's law. Poverty arises from inability to get work. Inability to get work arises from the fact that the general bounties of nature are appropriated as private property by a few, and the masses are deprived of their divine inheritance. And so, instead of having the equal right to get at the general bounties of nature, and thus exercise the right of supporting themselves and their families, the masses have to go begging of the few, of the classes, for the boon to labor.

We have a belief that poverty can be abolished by conforming human laws and institutions to the great principle of equal justice. We would abolish poverty that comes from crowding out God's children from the Father's estate, so that they are permitted to come back to it only on condition of becoming the tenants or serfs or slaves of their more favored brethren.

The poverty which we would abolish is no part of God's plan, but a blur and a blot on civilization—rather the creation of the ignorance of His plan—a poverty that causes man to curse God and revile and ridicule the thought of saying "Our Father."

Of his talk that week in Washington, given in the Congregational Church, I have found no record other than a sympathetic summary printed in *The Critic*, in which are several quoted passages, such as:

This is called a new crusade, but it is as old as God.

The object of this crusade is to teach the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man—and God has no stepchildren.

It is our object to teach a world-wide reverence for the true rights of property.

109 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

We are seeking to erect a lightning rod to avert the storm of anarchy.

Thanks to the opposition, the rod was not erected.

"WE WANT THE EARTH!"

Perhaps as "fighting" a speech as Father McGlynn ever delivered anywhere was addressed to the Anti-Poverty Society in New York on June 5, 1887, from which we note the following:

We wish to abolish poverty because it is the fruitful source of blasphemies that go up to heaven; because it is the immediate cause and occasion that makes men doubt whether there be a God at all, because from poverty comes the constant hatred of the existing order of things; and where men are forced to believe that it is God's order, they say: "We will have none of your God!" To abolish poverty, we want the earth! . -

They make a great mistake who think to force upon man, as if it were the very teaching of God, what their right reason, their natural and profoundest instincts, reject as an injustice. It is because of this abuse on the part of those who assume to speak in the various churches as if by the very voice of God, and in the name of God, that so large a portion of the people have turned their back upon the churches. The only way to bring men back to religion, to bring them back to God, is to make it clear, always and everywhere, that God is the God of truth; that God is the God of justice; that God is the God of infinite love, goodness and mercy; that His goodness is spread out over all His works; that human society is, of all the visible works of God, the highest, the noblest and best, and that in the divine plan human society was intended to send up to heaven such harmonies as to beggar all the boasted harmonies of the spheres. . .

110 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

And so we who are inspired by divine enthusiasm to justify the ways of God to man, to teach mankind that the miseries and crimes that so mar and blot society are the result not of God's law, but of the violation of God's law, are impelled to this not merely by a natural instinct of benevolence, but by those noble instincts that come from our Creator, impelling us to serve God by doing what we can to love our brethren. -

We wish, therefore, to abolish poverty, because we wish to enforce the ordinances of God in the maintaining and ruling of human society, and because we see clearly that God's plan for the prevention of poverty is that man should have the earth, and it is clearly God's only plan for the abolition of poverty to restore the earth to man again. We have no business to ask God to make another world outside of this that the masses may escape to in order to get a comfortable living. .

During a certain municipal campaign that seems now like very remote ancient history because so many things have happened since (*laughter and applause*), a certain prelate with a foreign title was called upon with a kind of Macedonian cry by the chairman of the committee on resolutions of a certain institution in this city. (*Hisses and boos*). And this right reverend prelate, in a letter which furnished a magnificent campaign document and which was printed and scattered broadcast before the doors of churches on the Sunday before election, said that he and others of the same profession as himself disapproved entirely of Mr. George's doctrines and found them bad in political economy, theology and everything else. A few days later a case-hardened man went to this right reverend prelate and said to him: "See here, Monsignor. Do you know that the younger clergy of this city are saying that you have

5 Mgr. Preston, Vicar-General.

111 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

not read any of Henry George's words?" Do you know what his answer was?:—"Why, of course not. Do you think a man can be expected to read all the trash that comes out nowadays?"

And there is a still more distinguished prelate in town to whom *I* undertook to send Mr. George with a letter of introduction and commendation, with the object that Mr. George should explain this terrible doctrine to him. Mr. George came back saying that he might as well have been talking to the marble of an adjacent church! Mr. George sent him a complete set of his works, and I doubt very much if he has read a page of them.

Men are saying that this new doctrine cannot be true because most of the respectable people, and the majority of the well-to-do classes, and nearly all the clergy and all the churches look upon it with suspicion and reprobation. Was it not the orthodox church and the goody-goody and respectable people in the church and state who excommunicated Christ and did Him to death? It was the high priest who said: "It is expedient that this man should die because He is perverting the people."

And what was His doctrine that they most feared? It was just this doctrine which we have said time and again is the very essence of all true religion, the very essence and core of this crusade—the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man; the doctrine of the Lord's Prayer; the doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount, the parable of the judgment day, the doctrine of the holy Gospel.

THE FORTY-DAY WAIT

It was in this first week of June that John McMackin made a flying trip upstate to organize land and labor clubs and arrange for a lecture tour by the Doctor. These lectures were delivered in Newburgh, Pough

112 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

keepsie, Albany, Troy, Syracuse, Oswego and Rochester during the first two weeks of June. Verily the Doctor must have been "coining money." He was—for the cause, not for himself. The St. Stephen's Parishioners were providing for him so well that he refused all honoraria for these addresses and paid his own expenses.

In its first June issue in 1887 the comic illustrated weekly *Puck* printed one of its inspired cartoons by Keppler, depicting the Corrigan-McGlynn controversy as a boxing match, with Pope Leo and Henry George as the seconds of the combatants. The audience was composed of various editors, clergymen and other publicists who had taken a hand in the dispute, predominantly Protestant, whose faces seemed to justify the caption: "It's a very pretty quarrel as it stands, and the Protestants can afford to smile, whoever wins."

Puck's "Protestants" were smiling all right, but it was a singular cartoon for that Catholic-baiter to publish, following as it did another of Keppler's, published a few weeks earlier, depicting a poor little kitten which an innocent family had taken in and nourished until **it** grew into a great Bengal tiger (Tammany) which destroyed the family.

This cartoon of *Puck's*, however, emphasized unintentionally some significant

changes that had come in the public mind in the year just passed, some good, some not so good. First, that old prejudices were passing away on both sides of the religious fence, with those on either side acknowledging that those on the other might be quite as good Christians as themselves. Second, that while one group of Protestants and Free Thinkers, composed largely of the wealthy and well-to-do, were vastly

113 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

pleased at the prospect of Dr. McGlynn's excommunication and were coming to regard the Catholic Church as a powerful and greatly needed "conservator of property rights," another and more numerous group of non-Catholics were opening their eyes to the fact that the Catholics were by no means as "priest-ridden" and slavish to their Church as they had been thought to be—that they could be ever so devoted to their faith without acknowledging political subjection to priest, bishop, Propaganda or Pope.

The Rev. Fr. Ballies, a Brooklyn priest of German birth whose English was broken and quaint and whose devotion to Archbishop Corrigan must have been embarrassing to that prelate, did much to add to the general gaiety of 1887, for the *Standard* began to send its reporter over to hear and record as nearly verbatim as possible his tirades against Dr. McGlynn, whom he classed with Martin Luther. The *Standard* compositors had strict orders to "follow copy" on these fulminations.

Another humorous feature of the "Forty-Day Wait" was a theory evolved by some newspaper reporters as they discussed possible whys and wherefores of Dr. McGlynn's strange behavior in the shadow of his impending excommunication. Someone suggested that there might be "a woman in the case"—that the Doctor was well satisfied to let things drift because his eye had fallen on some woman whom he loved, and to whom, when he was cast out by the Church, he would be married. To be sure, no one knew of any woman to whom the Doctor had been unduly attentive, but it was an interesting theory and gradually she took form. She was a wealthy widow who, casting amorous eyes on the

114 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

Doctor's goodly person, had taken deep thought on ways and means to separate him from the Church that she might possess him.

With an imagination worthy of a novelist a most ingenious theory was unfolded. She had read Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* and been entranced by it. Knowing the Doctor as she did, she judged that the book would not only entrance him, but start him on a rampage that would quickly get him into trouble with the Church authorities, and his uncompromising devotion to whatever he believed to be right would do the rest. So she had given him the book to read, it had worked on him as she had calculated, and now they were to be married!

The story got into the newspapers, and there the Doctor got his first information that he was to enter the holy and honorable estate of matrimony. At the very next meeting of the Anti-Poverty Society, to the merriment of his audience, he drew from his pocket the newspaper clipping of the story and read it. Then, announcing that he would introduce to them the widow in question, he called Mr. A. J. Steers, who was on the platform, and well known to most of those present, to the front,

told how Mr. Steers had given him *Progress and Poverty* nearly six years before, and promised that, if he ever did marry, it should be to none other than the “widow” who had given him that book.

While Dr. McGlynn, according to Pope Leo’s letter, was guilty of contumaciously and rebelliously promulgating “false doctrines concerning the right of property,” the *Standard* in its issue of June 18, 1887, published the full text of the pastoral Letter of Bishop

115 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

Nulty of Meath, Ireland, written to the priests and laity of his diocese in April, 1881, a quotation from which appears in this book (see page 24).

A perusal of this letter shows that Bishop Nulty in his preface especially disclaimed any “divine commission to enlighten you on your civil rights or to instruct you in the principles of land tenure or political economy,” and then, merely as a man learned in theology, law, history and political economy, proceeded to so enlighten them. Comparing this letter with the speeches of Dr. McGlynn, it is readily seen that the latter went no whit farther, if indeed as far, as the Bishop of Meath in his demand for “the land for the people.” Yet the Irish bishop never was involved in any dispute with Rome over the matter, never was admonished, suspended or threatened with suspension, though the “Castle Catholics” did all in their power to make him uncomfortable.

Archbishop Corrigan, however, had no hesitation in assuming the “divine commission” which the Bishop of Meath disclaimed, evincing as he disclaimed it a broader knowledge and understanding of theology and economics than the Archbishop of New York had ever shown.

On this date, June 18, also was held a parade planned by the Anti-Poverty Society and the St. Stephen’s Parishioners to demonstrate the public feeling for the Doctor. It was quite as impressive as had been the political parade which just before the election for Mayor in 1886 had stampeded thousands of Republicans into voting for the Tammany candidate as the only way to save society.” But the papers varied widely in their

116 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

estimates of the number parading. The *World* reported **7,500** in line. The *Times* set the number at 10,000. The *Sun* saw **12,000**. The *Tribune* admitted “over **30,000**.”

The *Star* and the *Morning Journal* agreed on the figure of **50,000**. The *Herald* topped the list by reporting **75,000**.

The St. Stephen’s Parishioners were accorded the honor of heading the parade with their enormous delegation, which alone probably exceeded the lower figures enumerated. There seemed to be no end to the banners carried in the parade bearing stirring sentiments expressive of the people’s undying love for and devotion to Dr. McGlynn and his crusade.

The magnitude of this protest against the Doctor’s excommunication inspired high hopes that the Pope would withhold that dread edict, but Henry George

appears to have believed otherwise, for in his *Standard* of June 25 appeared this little reminder of a past incident in the history of the Church, with an intimation that it was about to be repeated:

There stands hard by the palace of the holy inquisition in Rome a statue which has been placed there since Rome became the capital of United Italy. On it is this inscription:

“GALILEO GALILEI

was imprisoned in the neighboring palace
for having seen
that the earth revolves around the sun.”

In after years, when the true-hearted American priest shall have rested from his labors, and what is now being done is history, there will arise by the spot where he shall be excommunicated such a statue and such an inscription.

117 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

And days will come when happy little children, such as now die like flies in tenement houses, shall be held up by their mothers to lay garlands upon it.

On June 22 the Rev. Dr. Thomas of Chicago, who had got into trouble with the authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church because of his adoption of Henry George's economic views, introduced Dr. McGlynn to an audience which packed the Chicago Central Music Hall. The Doctor spoke of charity and justice, not as contrasts but as complementary to each other, paying high tribute to each. He closed with these words as reported by the *Standard*:

It is charity, charity that seeketh not her own, but is prodigal of self in order to win the brother. It was this charity, this love of mankind for God's sake, based upon love of God for His own sake, that converted the world to Christianity, that abolished slavery. And it is only in this spirit that the slavery that we are warring against can ever be abolished.

I should like to do a little toward restoring the glorious word charity to its proper place. Unfortunately, it too often is taken as meaning the mere doling out of alms. Is it not a monstrous injury that is done to the sweet name of charity to so degrade it that its occupation must be gone if there are no more beggars to be fed and clothed?

Charity is a noble virtue, but to make the whole world an almshouse is carrying it to the absurd. The noblest charity is to do justice—not only to procure, at the sacrifice of self, in an unselfish spirit, some improvement in the condition of mankind, but to compel tyrants to do justice to the victims they have wronged.

The supreme moral law, the law of gravitation in the

118 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

moral order, is justice. Justice is the one thing necessary to hold society together, to give each individual man the proper opportunity of exercising his God-given liberty. Justice must be like Him in whose bosom it finds its eternal resting place, universal—it must prevail throughout the universe of God.

When justice becomes the common atmosphere of human society, then men will take naturally to religion.

There is an old Latin saying, “Let justice be done though the heavens fall.” But let justice be done and the heavens will not fall to our ruin. Then the heavens will stoop to the embrace of earth and the earth will be lifted up to the kiss of heaven, and then on earth shall be at last fulfilled the Saviour’s Prayer, the prayer that all His children everywhere are reciting with yearning hearts: “Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done *on earth* as it is in heaven.”

The papers reported his speech with reasonable fairness and the *Inter-Ocean* took the trouble to interview the Catholic priesthood of the city to get their thought regarding Dr. McGlynn and his crusade. Several of them denounced him wrathily and intimated that he had taken leave of his senses. “But,” said the *Inter-Ocean*, “those who know anything of Dr. McGlynn, even those who are opposed to his views, spoke highly of him as a priest, as a scholar and as a man.” Father Butler of St. John’s Roman Catholic Church was quoted as saying:

Aside from his oratorical talent, his life has been singularly beautiful. He loves his fellow man, and himself last. All of his savings have been given to the poor, and much of his leisure to deeds of charity. His espousal of Henry George’s land views grew out of his desire to help the poor.

119 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

He is himself a poor man, With no resources other than as a lecturer and writer.

Six days later, June 28, 1887, Bishop McQuaid wrote a letter to Bishop Gilmour congratulating him on an article he had written condemning Dr. McGlynn and his friends, from which I quote:

The drubbing you gave the vile hypocrite and his tenderhearted sympathizers in *The Universe* was none too soon. I feel vexed that Gibbons, Keane, and Ireland get out of their scrape so quietly. They gave McGlynn a boost when he most needed it.

These prelates had been urging the Pope to take no action that could be construed as an interference in American political affairs.

Divided between admiration for the Doctor and allegiance to the Church, some of the Church organs managed to place themselves in rather illogical if not absurd attitudes. Thus the *Church Review and Ecclesiastical Register* in its June issue of 1887 printed an article by Dr. E. J. V. Huiginn wherein the writer made this rather vapid remark: “The Doctor cannot say that his views have not been properly understood in Rome; it would be a gratuitous assumption on his part to say so.

But that was precisely what the Doctor did say.

Continuing, Dr. Huiginn wrote: “Is there not scandal in the Church when the opinions of the infallible teacher are questioned by a fallible subject?”

That subsequent events cast a shadow of doubt on such “infallibility” is not to be

doubted.

120 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

Dr. Huiginn quoted many Scriptural incidents regarding the sale of land, as if the recital of those transactions upheld and justified the private-property-in-land institution, but he neglected to quote the Mosaic law on the subject, and seemed not to know of Solomon's dictum that "the profit of the earth is for all." Yet the article was laudatory of Dr. McGlynn personally, and there seemed to be in it an undertone of wistful hope that he might be right.

In the *Unitarian Review* in this same month appeared a keenly analytical review of the McGlynn case by Horace L. Traubel, under the caption: "Freedom and Half-Freedom," in which Dr. McGlynn and his fellow rebels were taken to task for having assumed what Mr. Traubel regarded as a rather paradoxical attitude. They took for their slogan, "All the religion you want from Rome, but *NO* politics," while at the same time they were asserting of their political agitation that it was a profoundly moral and even religious one, Dr. McGlynn himself saying that, if it were not so, he would have nothing to do with it. The paradox, of course, lay in the fact that morality underlies all political questions, morality is closely allied with religion, and the Church therefore had some basis under the terms of the O'Connell slogan for its assertion of universal authority in the matter. Mr. Traubel held that Dr. McGlynn and his Catholic friends could not remain half free and half subject to the Church in regard to the question at issue.

At least one American prelate, Right Rev. John Moore, D.D., Bishop of St. Augustine, Florida, cabled the Vatican, saying that to carry out the threatened

121 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

excommunication of Dr. McGlynn would be fraught with the gravest consequences in America. But the main point at issue as seen from Rome was the power of the Papal authorities to control the political action of Catholics. The Vatican desired to regain at least some fragments of its shattered temporal power through pressure upon Italy from other European governments, and the only thing it could offer for this pressure was its control, real or imaginary, over the political actions of its spiritual subjects.

EXCOMMUNICATED

The forty days' grace given to Dr. McGlynn by Cardinal Simeoni was drawing to a close and would expire on July ~. As the day approached it became certain that he would not go to Rome. Would he be excommunicated? There were doubts among the Doctor's friends. There also seemed to be doubts among the friends of the Archbishop. Items began to appear in the papers, apparently inspired by this doubt, to the effect that no formal excommunication was necessary; that his excommunication would be automatic—that he would excommunicate himself by his mere failure to appear at Rome as commanded.

Dr. Burtzell shattered this idea of informal or automatic excommunication, even pointing out that the most formal excommunication would be null if based on

mistaken premises. Instancing the famous case of Galileo, he held up for contemplation the complete nullity of any sentence of excommunication~ that might have been passed upon him for refusing to recant his

122 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

assertion that the earth revolved on its axis and moved around the sun!

It was obvious that the Archbishop had involved the Church in a dilemma from which it would have been glad to escape, but how? It appears to have dawned on Pope Leo that the spiritual and temporal powers of the Church must necessarily be in inverse proportion to each other—that as it gained the one it must relinquish the other.

Indeed, his own experience proved this, for he had become Pope in 1878, when the political power of the Church was near the vanishing point after the Italian revolution of the early '70s, and under his leadership the Church had gained greatly in spiritual influence.

But the organization as a whole was deeply committed to the enterprise of regaining as far as possible its shattered temporal power, and Archbishop Corngan's policy seemed in line with that enterprise.

Thus it came to pass that on July 4, 1887, the One Hundred and Eleventh anniversary of our national independence, there was published by the newspapers of the country a brief dispatch which seemed to extinguish whatever of independence the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church ever possessed:

ROME, July 4—Orders have been sent to the Archbishop of New York to excommunicate the Rev. Dr. McGlynn and to publish the decree of excommunication in the journals.

The Archbishop's edict of excommunication, read in the churches and published the following Sunday, July **10**, was as follows:

123 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

To the very reverend and -reverend clergy and the faithful laity of the Arch-Diocese of New York: Be it known that on the 4th day of May, 1887, the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda admonished the Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn, late rector of St. Stephen's Church in this city, that he had already rendered himself liable to ecclesiastical censure by disobeying the positive command of the Sovereign Pontiff given January **17**.

Wishing, however, to deal leniently with him, the Sacred Congregation refrained from inflicting censure, and, offering him a further opportunity to be heard in his own behalf, gave him a final and peremptory order to present himself in Rome within forty days from the receipt of the letter containing such order under pain of excommunication, to be incurred otherwise *ipso facto et nominatim*.

This letter was duly delivered to the Rev. Dr. McGlynn, and as he allowed the days of grace to pass unheeded, it became our sad duty to notify him that he had incurred by his own act this penalty of excommunication, by name, whereby he is cut off from the communion of the Church, from its sacraments, and participation in its prayers, and, should he persevere in his contumacy, deprived of the right after

death to Christian burial.

It has become also our duty to declare to the clergy and laity in our charge, which we do by this letter, that the Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn is excommunicated *nominatim*, with all the penalties attached to this censure by the canons of the Church.

MICHAEL AUGUSTINE,

Archbishop of New York.

C. E. McDonnell, Secretary. New York, July 8, 1887.

The reception accorded this edict of excommunication by the “influential” press now seems incredible.

124 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

The New York *Evening Post*, violently opposed to anything and everything that seemed likely to advance Catholic interest and influence in this country, fairly chortled with glee at this supposed crushing of the priest who had the temerity to insist on the politico-economic liberty of himself and his co-religionists, saying:

It will be interesting **from** this date to watch the sure and rapid disappearance of McGlynn as a force in politics .

So long as he was merely in dispute with the local church authorities he was able to have followers and sympathizers both in and out of his own church, but from the moment he is excommunicated all will be changed. No good Catholic can follow him after that, and as his following which is not Catholic is political, that too will drop away from him.

The New York *Times* concluded a tirade of misrepresentation in this fashion:

What ever of pity may be felt for Dr. McGlynn by any right-minded person must be felt in spite of the knowledge that his fate is deserved. He has not only deserved but invited it, and he has nobody but himself to blame that his career is closed and his life ruined.

The New York *Herald*, which on October **24**, 1880, had bravely said: “When a Catholic Irishman boasts that he will decide political contests in this city by means of the votes of **30,000** Irish Catholic voters upon whom he can count, the people have an opportunity to see what sort of institution the Catholic Church is in politics,” now lauded to the skies the Archbishop for thus undoing the priest who was sacrificing himself to

125 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

break down just such politico-ecclesiastical control. Wise men, these editors!

Perhaps the *Post* was right in saying “No good Catholic can follow him after that,” but it reckoned without the untold thousands who in one way or another, by open proclamation or quietly absenting themselves from church, made it known that if the *Soggarth Aroon* were not a good Catholic, neither were they. Many were they who made mighty vows never again to set foot in a Catholic Church unless

and until Dr. McGlynn was restored to the priesthood, and kept their vows. St. Stephen's Church was a particularly heavy sufferer from this defection, to Dr. McGlynn's great grief, for, fearing not for himself, he was aghast at the thousands of human souls which might be lost through their allegiance to him. His addresses from that time on were sprinkled with exhortations to those of his Catholic hearers who had left the Church to return to it for the sake of their immortal souls.

Some queer things found their way into the papers. The New York *Tribune* in its report of the excommunication made Archbishop Corrigan declare that the cause of the excommunication was the Doctor's "disobeying the positive commands of the Foreign Pontiff," a slip of the pen that probably told the truth more clearly than it could have been told otherwise.

The New York *Herald* on July 15, 1887, published the following, cabled from Rome:

Dr. McGlynn lost his best opportunity by not coming to Rome while Cardinal Gibbons was here. He would have seen that the Church, by not condemning the Knights of Labor, was the supporter of the many against the feudal

126 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

system, whether the feudality is represented by slavery, territorial right, or modern capital.

In other words, Dr. McGlynn's doctrine would have been all right had he gone to Rome, but became all wrong because he didn't go.

Considered in the light of subsequent events, there was tragic but unconscious humor in the comments of many Protestants, lay and clerical, and their official and unofficial church organs here and abroad, on the excommunication of Dr. McGlynn. They were divided between their dislike of the Papacy and their approval of what the Papacy had just done. The London *Saturday Review* raked up the outstanding abuses of the power of excommunication of which previous Popes had been guilty, and descanted on the evils thereof, but concluded that for once the power had been used with the utmost propriety. Then, warming to this theme, it quoted approvingly a suggestion from "a loyal Irish Catholic" in the Dublin *Daily Express* that the whole Irish Land League, both priests and laity, be given the choice between abandoning their agitation and suffering excommunication. The article conveys rather more than a hint of the pressure that British and Irish landed interests were exerting at Rome to induce the Pope to aid in suppressing the Irish revolt and everything which might aid it.

British diplomacy at Rome may be credited with having had much influence in securing Dr. McGlynn's excommunication, for his influence in Ireland was great. Though the Pope had not dared to appoint the choice of the landed interests to be Archbishop of

127 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

Dublin, the Vatican desired British aid in getting back some of the temporal power it had lost in Italy, and had done and was still doing much to soften the demands of

the Irish Nationalists. The Land League had laid aside the slogan, "The Land for the People," to adopt instead the narrow and relatively impotent cry of "Home Rule for Ireland" and "Twenty percent rent reduction for Irish farmers."

Michael Davitt said early in the dispute that Henry George had "made the mistake of supposing that the Rev. Dr. McGlynn's difference is with the whole Church instead of with Archbishop Corrigan and the Propaganda singly." Perhaps this was true when he said it, but the Archbishop had succeeded in making his mistake the mistake of the Church, arraying the organization on his side.

The excommunication of Dr. McGlynn had a sad effect on the other side of the water, for it so weakened the "land for the people" element in the Irish Land League that on July 22, 1887, Charles Stewart Parnell was enabled to make a speech in London in behalf of his "Home Rule Bill" which received unstinted praise from the "conservative" press of both Great Britain and this country ~or its "moderation." It richly deserved this praise, for everything of really practicable benefit to the Irish people had been carefully deleted from the bill. Asking the Irish especially to "take all that is good in the bill," and do nothing to imperil "harmonious relations" with Great Britain was really insulting to their intelligence. Within a few months Parnell was to fall into disgrace on disclosure of his relations with a married woman, and into deeper disgrace for the

128 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

more creditable act of marrying her after she had been divorced.

The Home Rule Bill was practically nullified during August by the amendments forced upon it by the House of Lords, the Liberal-Unionist alliance was broken up, and Ireland was given over to the horrors of the coercion era.

As for Archbishop Corrigan, when the expected excommunication of Dr. McGlynn fell he did not content himself with promulgating and publishing it. He proceeded to a reorganization of his diocese. A number of priests who had stood by Dr. McGlynn were punished by transference to other and less important missions. Dr. Burtzell, who already had been deposed from the pastorate of the Church of the Epiphany, was deprived of an important office in the diocese and sent to the little Church of St. Mary at Rondout, New York. The Archbishop explained this action by saying:

Dr. Burtzell has the name of being and is held by public opinion as well as by the followers of Dr. McGlynn, as by the clergy and the faithful of New York, to be not only a personal friend of Dr. McGlynn, but also the leader of those few discontented priests who more or less sustained Dr. McGlynn, and is moreover the counselor, defender and abettor of the latter.

From the time the edict of excommunication against Dr. McGlynn was published the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, long asserted and disputed, but finally promulgated formally by the Vatican in 1870, became a subject of spirited debate inside and outside of Catholic circles, non-Catholics generally holding it

129 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

in derision through their lack of understanding of the doctrine and its limitations.

The parallel drawn by Henry George between Dr. McGlynn's position regarding the earth as property and that of Galileo regarding the earth as the center of the universe came in for wide discussion. It hurt, of course, and gave sorrow to many devout Catholics. Some of the alibis offered by Catholics for the mistaken notions of the Church authorities of Galileo's day were remarkable, even fantastic, for the bearing of these notions on the infallibility of the Pope seemed obvious.

Of course Dr. McGlynn took his part in these discussions, and he presented the doctrine as it really is— that infallibility attaches to the Pope's utterances only when he speaks *ex cathedra* on faith and morals. But the discussions seemed to whittle even this away to a practically invisible theory.

An article ("Galileo Galilei Linceo") printed by the *Catholic World* of October, 1887, seems to the writer an amazing sample of finespun distinctions made by churchmen in their effort to reconcile confirmed truth with previously held error. The condemnation of the Copernican theory, said the writer of the article, was made by the Congregation, by the Holy Office, by the Cardinals, and approved by the Pope, but it was not a Pontifical act, *ex cathedra*, and, therefore, not infallible. The Pope can delegate to others the power to condemn books and doctrines, and he can approve their findings, but he cannot delegate his infallibility, which seems to be so precious a thing that, practically, it is seldom if ever used!

Dr. McGlynn over and over again set forth in his

130 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

speeches his understanding of Catholic doctrine and asserted that his condemnation was the work of the Congregation, the "ecclesiastical machine," and not of the Pope speaking *ex cathedra* for the Church.

Contrary to the hopes and expectations of the wise ones, Dr. McGlynn did not sink into obscurity. His people would not permit this. To them he was their martyr, sacrificing himself for them, though there is no evidence that he ever regarded himself in such a light.

The Anti-Poverty Society was at once reorganized on publication of the fact that his excommunication had been ordered. Its constitution, adopted July 7, 1887, was short and concise:

The time having come for an active warfare against the conditions that, in spite of the advance in the powers of productions condemn so many to degrading poverty, and foster vice, crime and greed, the Anti-Poverty Society has been formed.

The object of the Society is to spread, by such peaceable and lawful means as may be found most desirable and efficient, a knowledge that God has made ample provision for the needs of all men during their residence upon the earth, and that involuntary poverty is the result of the human laws that allow individuals to claim as private property that which the Creator has provided for the use of all.

Incidentally, it was formed with a view to providing for Dr. McGlynn an implement and support in his new line of work, that he might be free to "assert eternal providence~ and justify the ways of God to man." This work began in earnest at the first meeting of the Society following his excommunication.

If any retained the notion that the edict of excommu

nication meant isolation and Ostracism for Dr. McGlynn, this meeting of the Society at the Academy of Music on the evening of the day it was published, July 10, 1887, must have disillusioned them. Half an hour before the time for opening the meeting the theater was packed and the streets adjacent were crowded with people who could not be admitted. Irving Hall was secured for an overflow meeting, but this also was inadequate and many thousands were disappointed. The Doctor spoke at both meetings. In the Academy there was a great outpouring of the Doctor's old parishioners from St. Stephen's, as well as many prominent citizens—doctors, lawyers, business men, and a number of clergymen. Among those on the platform were James

J. Gahan, thrown out of a job by the suspension of the *Catholic Herald*, who presided; Henry George, who made a short speech in Irving Hall; James Redpath, James F. Archibald, John McMackin, John F. Breslin and various other labor leaders.

When the Doctor's name was mentioned the applause stopped the proceedings, and when he finally appeared it shook the building. "Three cheers for the *Soggarth Aroon!*" "They'll hear this in Rome!" "They can excommunicate the rest of us!" were among the cries heard.

About all that could be heard of Mr. Gahan's few words of introduction was something to the effect that Dr. McGlynn was "the best isolated man in America," and that he was about to introduce to the audience "the ideal priest of America." It took him six minutes by the clock to say that much, the time between these frag

mentary sentences being taken by the audience in expressing its appreciation and approval.

Those who saw and heard the Doctor that evening are not in exact agreement regarding his appearance. Some say he was cool and collected. Others say he was pale and nervous—that his face revealed the Gethsemane he had been through. It is probable that each saw in him some reflection of his own state of mind. It is possible, even probable, that a considerable number of the audience that Sunday evening feared, perhaps half-expected, that some dreadful calamity would befall him as he rose to speak. He began quietly with an adjuration to follow conscience. His speech, published in full by the *Standard*, was in part as follows:

If we do not follow conscience, Revelation appeals to us in vain. Our God is wondrously merciful, and He will never condemn any one who steadfastly follows this guide, even though he may sometimes mistake its light. It is a teaching of Catholic theology that he who follows the guidance of his conscience is obeying the will of God. It is the teaching of the theology that I learned under the shadow of the Vatican itself, that the man who sins against his conscience sins against the Holy Ghost, and that to obey any man, even him that is enthroned in the Vatican, against one's conscience, is to sin against the Holy Ghost ...

Catholic theology is nearly always better than its professors. It teaches that one atom of truth can never clash with another in all God's universe. But, unfortunately, its expounders think otherwise. It is this stupidity on their part, their

attempts to abridge human liberty of thought and action, that is driving whole nations out of the Church. The only way for the Church to convert the world is to

133 / THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

show that perfect harmony exists between reason and revelation, between grace and nature. Men must distinguish, however, between Christ's truth and the teachings of men whose blunders and cupidity fill every page of Roman Catholic history for over a thousand years.

He went on to tell how he had been asked to retract his land theories and the expression of his sympathies with the "Irish revolution," as it was called, but declared that he would "rather be burned alive." He created a sensation by stating, what had not previously been known, that the Archbishop had actually offered to him the care of the parish at Middletown, New York, at the time of his suspension from St. Stephen's, and commented on it thus:

I would consider it an honor to be the shepherd of the lowliest flock of Christ, but here was the Archbishop prepared to make an example of me, and impair my usefulness in the community, yet also prepared to appoint me the shepherd of souls, the guide and spiritual director of that flock! I have it in black and white, in his own handwriting.

He concluded his address on the same theme with which he began it:

In my words and deeds I find nothing now to regret. What I did I did in duty to myself and to my rights and obligations as a citizen, and there is nothing for my conscience to regret. A chain of circumstances has given the ecclesiastical machine an opportunity to inflict every indignity upon me. They have done their worst. Yet I never felt more at peace with God and the world.

They threaten me with exclusion from the sacraments and with denial of Christian burial after death. They may

134 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

throw my body into the sea or burn it. What I care about is the welfare of my poor soul. And I am theologian enough to know, and I have always taught it, that, precious as the sacraments are, they are only signs and symbols, and a man may be saved without them if God's grace be given to him and his heart and mind are clear and pure before God. And so I have done nothing and said nothing but what I saw my way clear to do and felt it my duty to say and do in justice to myself, my country, my kinsfolk, to humanity itself. My soul is still at peace with God and I am still one in heart with the doctrines and practices of the Church.

... No power on earth can excommunicate a child of God from God unless with the consent of that child himself. There are only two beings in all the universe who can separate me from my God. One is God Himself, the other is Edward McGlynn. God is all wise and all merciful, and He will not do it unless Edward McGlynn so wills it, and that I will never do!

This lightning is stage lightning; this thunder is stage thunder. I know enough of

canonical law to know that an unjust excommunication cannot stand, and the thing has been proven many times before.